Vol. IX, No. 2 March, 1940

# JOURNAL

OF THE

# ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

EDITOR

PROFESSOR B. V. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU, M.A., B.COM., PH.D., BAR-AT-LAW

EDITORIAL BOARD

PROFESSOR C. S. SRINIVASACHARIAR, M.A.
PROFESSOR A. NARASINGA RAO, M.A., L.T.
MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA PROFESSOR S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRIAR, M.A.
PROFESSOR S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, M.A., D.SC. (LOND.), F.INST.P. (LOND.).
PROFESSOR R. RAMANUJACHARI, M.A.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY

ANNAMALAINAGAR

1940

JL

T4m 211A, N32

N40.9.2 jl

94975

# NOTICE

## To contributors and others

Contributions, remittances, books for review, exchanges and correspondence regarding all matters may be addressed to:—

**Dr. B. V. Narayanaswami Naidu**

*Economics Department,*
*Annamalai University,*
*Annamalainagar.*

## CONTENTS

PAGE

1. Certain Philosophical Bases of Madhva's Theistic Realism
*By B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma* .. 65

2. Studies in Sanskrit Texts on Temple Architecture with Special Reference to the Tantrasamuccaya
*By N. V. Mallayya* .. 113

3. The Nayaks of Tanjore
*By V. Vridhagirisan* .. 227

# JOURNAL

OF THE

# ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY

VOL. IX. MARCH No. 2


# Certain Philosophical Bases of Madhva's Theistic Realism


*(Continued from Vol. VIII, No. 2, page* 171.)



BY

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI ŚARMA

*(Annamalai University)*


## CHAPTER III

### FREEDOM AND FREEWILL

The question of human freedom and divine control assumes great importance in Madhva's philosophy as he is anxious to emphasise both and maintain that human freedom is not inconsistent with divine control. It is man himself and not God that is responsible for the evil and suffering in this world.

Following the Sūtrakāra and consistent with his Theistic Realism, Madhva proclaims the human soul to be a real agent in all its actions. If we do not admit the agency of the Jīva, the Śāstra which lays down injunctions and prohibitions with reference to the achievement of specific results and the moral law on which these are ultimately grounded, would lose all significance and lapse into a cry in the wilderness. It cannot be that the Śāstra is addressed either to the insentient or to God himself. The jaḍa is incapable of responding to any mandate and God is above the purview of commandments. They cannot therefore have reference to any but the souls.[1]

1. अस्त्येव जीवस्यापि कर्तृत्वम् । तदभावे.... ... ... ... ......... ... । (TP).

This would not however make the Jīva the absolute and independent doer in all cases. The ultimate power of direction is vested in the Lord. The Jīva pursues of his own free will, a course of action that is determined mostly by his own deep-rooted nature, inclination and past Karma. But even this is possible because God has delegated to him the power to do things in conformity with his own innate goodness or its reverse. But he is not, for that reason, a mere puppet in the hands of God. The right to choose between right and wrong is the Jīva's own and the choice comes from him. It may therefore be stated that the Jīva is both doer and non-doer[2] even as a carpenter in the service of an Architect is a real agent in so far as he works at his job with his hands and tools, but is not merely obliged to the latter from the beginning but looks up to him for advice, guidance and direction. The Jīva's activity is not merely however like that of the carpenter. There is a vital distinction between the two. The carpenter is doubtless under an obligation to his employer and under a contract for the fulfilment of which he would receive due payment; but his skill and workmanship are his own. He does not owe them to his employer. Not so the Jīva. He derives even the ability to do anything from the Creator: परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः (B.S. ii, 3, 41.) i.e., to say that but for God, he cannot even move an inch: नेते त्वत् क्रियते किंचनारे (R.V. x.112,9). This would not however involve God in the meshes of action and make him responsible, ultimately for the good or bad in the life of the Jīvas; for it should be kept in mind that the Lord *enables* the Jīvas to pursue a course of action *not* arbitrarily, but in strict conformity witht his former life and deserts: कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षः (B.S. ii, 3, 42). He does *not interfere* in the decision in any way: Cf. यथेच्छसि तथा कुरु (Gītā, xviii.63)

This he does, not out of any compulsion from anyone but out of a desire to preserve the significance and validity of the Śāstra which prescribes that a man shall reap as he sows—and the moral law that good leads to good and evil to evil,[3] and keep his own part in the transaction above the charges of partiality and pitilessness.[4] It is a law which God sets unto himself; the limitation therefore is hardly an external one.[5]

2. स्वातन्त्र्याभावापेक्षयैव जीवस्याकर्तृत्वम् :—

स्ववन्दनं यथा पित्रा कारितं शिशुकर्तृकम् ।
एवं पूजा विष्ण्वधीना भवेज्जीवकृतेत्यपि ॥ इति प्रवृत्ते ॥

यथा पितृदत्तं पालकत्वं राजपुत्राणामेवं परमात्मदत्तं क्रियास्वातन्त्र्यलक्षणं कर्तृत्वम् । (G.T. V, p. 679)

3. पुण्यो वै पुण्येन कर्मणा पापः पापेन (*Śruti*)

4. अपेक्षा तु वैषम्याद्यप्राप्तये .

5. स्वेच्छानिमित्तैव (TP)

But since even the beginningless Karma of the soul is, in a metaphysical sense, dependent upon Him, God's sovereignty is at no time minimised.[6] The so-called divine intervention in our actions, consists then, merely in this that God directs our activities in accordance

6. अपेक्ष्यकर्मसत्तादेरपि स्वाधीनत्वात् ; नहि स्वाधीनसत्तादिमदपेक्षायामस्वातन्त्र्यं भवति ॥
If for the same reason, the charges of partiality, etc., are laid at the door of God, Madhva answers that *such partiality*, etc., are no faults. Only a partiality that upsets the moral order need be denied of God :—

कर्मादीनां सत्त्वस्यापि तदधीनत्वात् । न पुनर्वैषम्याद्यापातेन दोषः । तादृशवैषम्यादेरुपलभ्यमानत्वात् (II. 1, 37). Jayatirtha makes the point clearer :— यदि कर्मसत्तापि तदधीना, तर्हि तदपेक्षा नामानपेक्षैवार्थाद्भवति । तथा च पुनर्वैषम्याद्यापातः स्यात्, तथा च दोषित्वमिति चेन्न । स्वाधीनकर्मसापेक्षया फलदानरूपवैषम्यादेरीश्वरेऽदोषतयैव श्रुतावुपलभ्यमानत्वादिति भावः । एवं तर्हि कर्मसापेक्षापि निष्फला ; तदभावेऽपि दोषाभावसंभवादिति चेन्मैवम् । कर्मानपेक्षत्वे वेदाप्रामाण्यप्रसङ्गात् ॥ (TP)

The same idea is expounded by Madhva in his *Av.* :—

वैषम्यं निर्घृणत्वं च वेदाप्रामाण्यकारकम् ।
नाङ्गीकार्यमतोन्यत्तु न वैषम्यादिनामकम् ॥

which is thus elaborated by Jayatīrtha :—

द्विविधं खल्विदं वैषम्यं निर्घृणत्वं च । एकं कर्माद्यनपेक्षताप्रयुक्तम् । तत्राद्यं वेदाप्रामाण्यकारकत्वेन दूषणत्वान्नाङ्गीकर्तुमुचितम् । वेदो हि धर्मं सुखसाधनमधर्मं दुःखसाधनमाह । तत्र यदीश्वरो धर्माधर्माव-नपेक्ष्य विषमो निर्घृणश्च स्यात्, तदा वेदोदितधर्माधर्मयोः सुखदुःखसाधनत्वमसत् स्यात् । तथा च कथं तस्य प्रामाण्यं स्यात्? अतः सूत्रकारेण कर्मादिसापेक्षतापक्षमुररीकृत्य तत् परिहृतम् । अतोऽन्यत्तु द्वितीयं वैषम्यं नैर्घृण्यं च न वैषम्यादिनामकम् ; दोषरूपं न भवतीति यावत् ॥ (NS. p. 312b)

and elsewhere by Madhva himself :—

विषमत्वं तु दोषाय शुभाशुभविपर्यये ।
अतस्तादृशवैषम्यं ब्रह्मसूत्रे निराकृतम् ॥
शुभाशुभनियन्तृत्वं न दोषो गुण एव सः ।
अतस्तदिष्टं कृष्णस्य ब्रह्मसूत्रकृतो विभोः ॥ (B.T. vii, 18, 12)

[The existence of Karma etc., depends on Him. It cannot be contended that partiality and other faults, would again crop up. For such partiality etc., are no flaws.

If the existence of Karma too is dependent on Him, then to depend upon them is as good as not depending on them. Thus again partiality would stare him in the face and He would be sullied. We should like to point out that such partiality as consists in dispensing rewards and punishments in proportion to acts, which are of course dependent on Him, is not represented to be a foible in the śruti. It cannot be argued that to depend on individual Karma under such conditions, is after all futile as even without such de-

with our past Karma, efforts and deserts. In the absence of this ultimate power of direction, nothing would be possible in the world. The soul is thus a free agent in respect of its chosen path—nay, in choosing the one when two courses are open to him, but the power to traverse that path once the choice has been made, is derived from the Lord. Subject to this condition, man *is* a real agent :

एतदेवं न चाप्येवमेतदस्ति न चास्ति च ।

[It (i.e., the agency of the soul) is like this ; it is not like this. It is there, it is not there.]

(*Mbh.* q. by Madhva, B.S. ii, 3, 42).

Elsewhere, (in his *GT*), Madhva gives a telling analogy to illustrate the relative dependence of the Jīva :

पुमान् दोग्धा च गौर्दोग्ध्री स्तनो दोग्धेतिवत् क्रमात् । (p. 675).

[The cowboy milks, the cow yields (the milk) and the udder yields (the milk) ].

Such is Madhva's solution of the problem of Freewill vs. Determinism in life. It goes much further than similar attempts to solve the problem

pendence the flawlessness of God could be maintained. The reason is that if Karma is not consulted, the moral law would be impugned (and the Scripture would lose validity).

Such partiality and pitilessness as jeopardise the validity of Scripture cannot be accepted. Anything other than that is not strictly speaking a partiality at all.

Two kinds of partiality and pitilessness there are. One results from disregard of individual Karma etc. The other lies in depending on them in so far as they themselves are subject to God. Of these, the first one must be rejected as it impairs the validity of the Vedas. For the Veda prescribes right as the means of achieving happiness and warns us against unrighteousness as it brings on misery. Such being the case, if God should act in a pitiless and partial way, irrespective of our Karma, it would mean that the law of right and wrong taught in the Vedas, would be rendered meaningless. How then could they be held valid thereafter ? Therefore it is that the Sūtrakāra admitting the view of God's acting in accordance with Karma, has set at rest the possibility of partiality etc. The other variety of "partiality and pitilessness," is not strictly speaking a foible at all. It does not amount to a defect.

A partiality that interferes with right and wrong is a blemish. Hence it has been rejected in the Sūtras. The proper control of right and wrong and meting out rewards and punishments in accordance with them, is no fault. It is an asset. Hence it is acceptable to Bādarāyaṇa]

by other commentators on the Vedānta. Within a limited sphere, man is free to do as he pleases. There is room for individual effort and initiative. The striving for good or bad constitutes the act of freedom whereby Karma ripens and everyone works out his own destiny. The question is easy to ask: "If He is the cause of everything, does the Lord *influence* the will of the Jīva or not? If He does, then He is responsible for all acts and there can be no freedom of choice for the individual. If he does not, He is powerless, to that extent." Madhva's answer shifts the responsibility for good or bad, to the Jīva or more precisely to his original nature (स्वरूपयोग्यता).

Most Indian philosophers would rather take shelter under the inexorable law of Karma to reconcile the presence of Evil and inequalities in this world with the goodness of God. Madhva has been the only one to push the question to its logical extreme. Karma implies freedom and freedom implies a choice. But it does not explain *why a particular choice is made.* Even a chain of beginningless Karma cannot explain why all souls are not equally good or bad when all of them are equally eternal and all their Karmas too are equally beginningless and the start simultaneous! The only possible explanation is that offered by Madhva, viz., that the Karma itself is the result of an unchanging and underlying nature स्वरूप of each soul.[7]

Even this original nature is, in a metaphysical sense, subject to the Lord; but, this does not interfere with the progress of Man. For God does not interfere to change the nature of beings. The nature of the soul is *allowed* to have its course, whatever it may be. This is the law of God which he sets to himself. There is thus no fear of his sovereignty being compromised. The moral character of God is also preserved on such a view; for, we can accuse God of partiality and cruelty only when He changes the nature of some in preference to others. Madhva would argue that non-interference with the "Svarūpa" of souls does not necessarily denote an inability to do so.[8] The explanation would rather

7. It is this same difference and distinction which enables Madhva to account for the persistence of multiplicity of souls even in Mokṣa, where the Karmic chain is destroyed. And as already shown, multiplicity without distinction would be an impossible concept.

8. Cf. his remarks on an allied topic—न च प्रकृतेः संसाराभावादिना ईश्वरेणाप्यन्यथा कर्तुमशक्यत्वेन सुदृढत्वात् सर्वसाम्यमेवेश्वरेणेति युक्तम्। ईशस्य महामहिमत्वात्, नित्यसंसारित्वस्य नित्यं तदनुग्रहेणैवोपपत्तेः ॥ (*Ny. Vivaraṇa*, iv, 2, 6)
"To show that the law of Karma is not independent of God, it is sometimes said that God can suspend it, still He does not will to do so." See also the extract from

lie in the inexorable will of the Lord. Nothing can limit His will and movements save Himself.

The theory of "Svarūpabheda" elaborated by Madhva is thus the only solution of the agelong problem of the plurality of Selves, their freewill and freedom. Questions like the following have been asked by Religionists and philosophers all the world over: "The Jīva was not created out of a void, at a particular time; but he is nonetheless, an expression of the nature of God. How then does he happen to be so imperfect while his archetype is also the type of perfection"? St. Augustine's agony of soul was still more poignant: "Who made me? Did not God who is not only good but goodness itself? Whence then, came I to will evil and nill good so that I am thus justly punished? Who set *this* in me and ingrafted in me this plant of bitterness, seeing that I was wholly formed of my most sweet God?" (*Confessions,* Bk. VII, 4-5). The question is answered by Madhva under B.S. ii, 3, 51: प्रतिबिम्बानां मिथो वैचित्र्ये कारणमाह—अदृष्टानियमात्' इति। अनादिविद्याकर्मादिवैचित्र्याद्वैचित्र्यम्॥[9] on the basis of a fundamental and corresponding difference in beginningless Karma, Vidyā, etc., which ultimately rests upon an innate difference in *nature.*[10] It is thus *in the nature* of some souls to "will evil and nill good" and of others to "will good" and "nill evil". Yet others are of a mixed nature and these, in the language of Hume, would be "neither good enough for a supper, nor bad enough for a drubbing". These would answer to the "Nityasamsārins"[11] of Madhva. It is thus only a half-truth to say that "Freewill is the cause of our doing evil". (Augustine). The question must ultimately arise why when one is free to will good or evil, he does the one and not the other. Not because he has a *free* will; for that same free will might have suggested the other course! That it does not do, or has not done so, must depend on something more ultimate and foundational in the nature of the soul. And *that something,* says Madhva, is the core of the man, his Svarūpa. It would be useless to dispute the logic of this contention, however distasteful to one's *amour propre,* the conclusion may be.

Lokācārya's *Tattvatraya,* given, in this connection, on p. 694, of S. Radhakrishnan's *I. Phil.* Vol. II.

9. 'आदि' will naturally imply 'स्वरूप' as may be expected from the very nature of the Pūrvapakṣa under ii, 3, 51: नचैकप्रतिबिम्बानां मिथो वैचित्र्यं सम्भवति ।

10. Cf. त्रिविधा भवति श्रद्धा देहिनां सा स्वभावजा ॥ (*Gītā* 17, 2).

11. Vide *Tattvasamkhyāna.*

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE BRAHMAN IS SAGUṆA

Madhva conceives the Brahman as endowed with an infinite number of auspicious attributes. The conception of the Saguṇa has been assailed by Monists as being metaphysically untenable. There is difficulty in assuming these attributes to be either different from or identical with the Brahman. If different, they must be *related* to the Brahman from without and that relation would have to be similarly related to the terms by yet another one and so on *ad infinitum*.[1] If the two are identical, their distinction as subject and attribute becomes meaningless and the truth would rather be that there are really no attributes ![2] The Advaitin, therefore, denies attributes to Brahman. Rāmānuja distinguishes the Brahman from its attributes. Madhva admits attributes for the Brahman but denies at the same time, that they are different from it. Brahman and its attributes are inseparable, indistinguishable. But the distinction in speech and writing, between them, is not a meaningless fiction. Nor can the attributes be both different from and identical with (bhedābheda) the Brahman, as the same difficulties and regress would crop up severally on this view. There is no way out of the difficulty unless it is granted that the attributes though part and parcel of the Brahman and hence indistinguishable from it, can yet be separated in thought and referred to in language, in their separation. There is thus neither an absolute and *unqualified* difference between God and his attributes, nor even a *colorless identity*. It is an identity that is compatible with differentiation that we have, between the Brahman and its attributes. Language secular scientific and metaphysical has numerous examples of this kind to offer :— पुरुषस्य चैतन्यम् ; राहोः शिरः ; स्वरूप स्वरूपत्वम्; समवायस्यैकत्वम् ; अहिकुण्डलम् ; सत्यंज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म, आनन्दं ब्रह्मणः A triangle is a three-sided figure the sum of whose angles is equal to two right angles. Here the two *ideas* are *separable* in thought and language though the one involves the other. Even so in the case of the Brahman, and its attributes. Not only is

1. नच गुणगुण्यादि भेदसम्बन्धः संभवी। तस्य सम्बन्धस्य ततो भिन्नत्वे गुणवदेव सम्बन्धान्तरापेक्षत्वादनवस्था।

2. अभिन्नत्वे वस्तुमात्रमिति न सम्बन्धः स्यात् ॥

(Trivikrama Paṇḍita, *Tattvapradīpa,* Catus-sūtri Bhāṣya, p. 12)

there according to Madhva no difference between the Brahman and its attributes but among the attributes themselves :—

अनन्तगुण एवासौ तेचाभिन्ना हरेर्गुणाः ।
परस्परमभिन्नाश्च सर्वे धर्माश्च तद्गताः ॥ (*B.T.* x, 3, 37.)

This position of Madhva has a remarkable affinity to the orthodox Thomist doctrine :—" In God, the distinction between Existence and Essence must fall away. God can have no nature or essence distinguishable from and making itself felt through the phases of his actual existence. Here and *here only,*[3] the distinction between essence and existence, would have no meaning, and consequently, the distinction between an attribute and that which is the subject of the attribute, would be meaningless also. Of the Divine Being we can say, as of nothing else, that it is its own goodness. Its goodness is not *adjectival* to it,[4] because, in it it is all one (and the same) *to be* and *to be good* ".[5]

Nor can the usages referred to in secular and scientific parlance be dismissed as resting on a mere mode of speech (Upacāra), as that would mean that the attributes predicated have no real existence.[6] The theory put forward by Madhva, is the only one that could effectively surmount the various difficulties involved in any attempt to establish a logical relation between God and His attributes, and conserve His homogeneity and the reality of His attributes. The theory is known as (the doctrine of) " Sa-viśeṣābheda " (सविशेषाभेद).

Madhva recognises with the Advaitin that there can be no difference of Substance and Attributes in Brahman. But that does not entitle us to suppose that the attributes are *less real* than the Brahman, or that they or their attribution to the Brahman, is illusory. He takes his stand upon significant texts in the *Kaṭha*, etc.,

एवं धर्मान् पृथक् पश्यंस्तानेवानुविधावति ।
नेह नानास्ति किंचन; य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥

3. गुणगुणिभावस्तु एकत्र—ब्रह्मणि विशेषाद्युज्यते ॥ (Td. p. 87)

4. Madhva would however observe that it *can be so termed* with the help of Viśeṣas.

5. Quoted from an extract in G. Dawes Hick's *Hibbert Lectures,* 1937, on " The Philosophical Bases of Theism ", p. 258.

6. न चौपाचारिकं समवायसत्त्वम् ; मुख्यतस्तदभावप्रसङ्गात् ॥ (*Tattvapradīpa,* p. 12)

Jayatīrtha sums up the argument beautifully :—

यदि धर्मा एव न सन्ति, तर्हि 'नेहास्ति किंचन' 'धर्मान् पश्यन्' इत्येव वक्तव्यम्। 'नाना' इति—'पृथक्' इति च व्यर्थमेव। तेन, सन्ति धर्माः; किं तु, न भिन्ना, नापि भिन्नाभिन्ना इति श्रुत्यर्थः। अनयैव श्रुत्या विशेषोऽपि द्योतितः॥

(V.T.N. ṭīkā, p. 121b)

[If there had been no attributes, the sense would be complete with such terms as 'There is nothing here' 'Seeing attributes' and so on. As it is, the expressions 'different' (पृथक्) and 'separately' (नाना) are without a content. Hence we infer that the real meaning is that there *are* attributes; but that they are neither *different or separate* from the Brahman nor partly different and partly identical with it; but part and parcel of it. The concept of Viśeṣa too is hinted at by this Śruti.]

It is not merely by implication that we know that there are attributes in the Brahman. Direct statements to the effect are not wanting in Scripture :—

परास्य शक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वभाविकी ज्ञानबलक्रिया च।

(Śvet. Up. vi.8)

मय्यनन्तगुणेऽनन्ते गुणतोऽनन्तविग्रहे। (Bhāg. vi.4.48)

ज्ञः कालकालो गुणी सर्वविद्यः। (Śvet. Up. vi.2)

We cannot ascribe these attributes to the working of Māyā, as the text rules out the possibility of their being adventitious and due to Māyā, by the emphatic declaration that they are "Svābhāvika", essential and natural to Brahman. Neither can the so-called 'Nirguṇa-text': एको देवः.....................केवलो निर्गुणश्च be of much avail, as the earlier part of it itself refers to a string of attributes in Brahman, such as oneness (एकत्व) godliness (देवत्व) immanence (सर्वभूतेषु गूढः) all-pervasiveness (सर्वव्यापी) lordship of creatures (सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा) lordship of Karma (कर्माध्यक्षः) omnipresence (सर्वभूताधिवासः) witnessing capacity (साक्षी) and sentience (चेता). In the circumstances therefore, निर्गुण cannot mean that the Brahman is utterly devoid of any attributes whatever.

The doctrine of Viśeṣas is thus forced upon everyone of us by the very laws of thought. Even the Advaitin (Akhaṇḍārthavādin), says

Madhva, is forced to concede[7] the operation of Viśeṣas, in respect of the attributes predicated of the Brahman in such texts as 'सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म' Are the qualities सत्यं, ज्ञानम् and अनन्तम्' mutually different or not? If they are, we have to admit an element of plurality in Brahman, which cannot be. If they are all the same, there is no need to posit three of them, as any one of them will do. They would thus be synonymous in effect (पर्यायशब्द) and hence redundant. It cannot be that there *are* or may be subtle shades of difference amongst them; for, the Brahman is *ex hypothesi* Nirviśeṣa without any shade of any kind of difference or peculiarity. Nor can their employment be defended on the assumption of "affirmation through negation of the opposite." (अनृतादिव्यावृत्तिमुखेन) Even there must be recognised, some kind of distinction from the *opposite so negated* as otherwise, the entire negation would be a meaningless proposition.[8]

The distinction from 'unreality (anṛta) must perforce be distinct from the distinction from ignorance, limitation, etc. The doctrine of Saviśeṣābheda is thus forced upon all as a "Sarvatantrasiddhānta". None who respects the laws of thought can escape it.[9]

7. See *Anuvyākhyāna*, i, 1, adh. 1, ver. 105-13 and iii, 2, p. 36-7 :—

सच्चिदादेरपर्यायसिद्ध्यमर्थं मायिनापि हि ।
अङ्गीकार्यो विशेषोऽयं ... ... ... ॥
अखण्डखण्डवादिभ्यां .... .... .... ।
महादरेण शिरसि विशेषो धार्य एव हि ॥

8. Cf. किं ब्रह्मविशेषणत्वेन असत्वादिव्यावृत्तिबोधः प्रयोजनमुच्यते ? उत स्वतन्त्र एव व्यावृत्तिबोधः [नाद्यः निर्विशेषत्वात् । न द्वितीयः । अजिज्ञासितत्वात् ] (NS. p. 105)

अखण्डवादिनोऽपि स्याद्विशेषोऽनिच्छतोऽप्यसौ ।
व्यावृत्ते निर्विशेषे तु किं व्यावर्त्यबहुत्वतः ? ॥ Av. i, p. 10b.

9. It is known to the Sūtrakāra (iii, 2, 27) and is implied in 'एवं धर्मान्' As a matter of fact it is an ancient doctrine of the Pañcarātrikas as may be gathered from the comments of Śamkara himself on B.S. II, 4, 48. Naturally then it appears to have been elaborated in the Samhitās of the Pañcarātra, some of which have been quoted by Madhva in his *VTN.* :—

गुणक्रियादयो विष्णोः स्वरूपं नान्यदिष्यते ।
अतो मिथोऽपि भेदो न ; तेषां कश्चित्कदाचन ॥
स्वरूपेऽपि विशेषोऽस्ति स्वरूपत्ववदेव तु ।
भेदाभावेऽपि तेनैव व्यवहारश्च सर्वतः ॥ इति परमोपनिषदि ॥

There are doubtless certain texts in Scripture which deny all predicates to the Brahman; but Madhva contends that for reasons already stated, they must be taken to deny only finite and false attributes to Brahman,—not all attributes whatever. In this he is one with Rāmānuja and other Theistic philosophers and has the support of the interpretative literature of the Purāṇas.[10]

The Advaitins' objection that all attributes are, in the last analysis, relative and so cannot be predicated of the Absolute Brahman, is not so invulnerable as it may seem; since सत्ता ज्ञान and "आनन्त्य" existence, knowledge and absence of limitations recognised to be present in the Brahman,[11] are themselves relative (to an 'other') in that they presuppose Time and Space and objects to be known or at least their opposites of non-existence, ignorance and limitation, from which the Brahman is sought to be distinguished. If there be no reality or knowledge *in* Brahman, how is one to distinguish it from that which is unreal or ignorant? Such distinction at least must be real and to that extent the Brahman would become relative to an "other".

Madhva conceives of the Brahman as Sva-prakāśa, but not in the Advaitic sense of the term. The self-luminosity of the Brahman as understood by the Advaitin, is without a content. That which would neither illumine itself nor consent to be illumined by another can only be a blank[12]:

न च सर्वप्रमाणागोचरत्वे तदस्तीति सिद्ध्यति[12]। नास्तित्वं तु सप्तमरसादिवत अदर्शनात सिद्ध्यति। स्वप्रकाशत्वं च नामानं सिद्ध्यति। स्वप्रकाशत्वं च ततोऽतिरिक्तं चेद्विशेषाङ्गीकारः। न चेत्तदेव प्रमाणगोचरम्। तत्प्रमाणाभावे परप्रकाशत्वमात्रनिरासे स्वप्रकाशत्वे प्रमाणाभावात्, अप्रकाशत्वमेव स्यात्! (*GT*. V. p. 680b).

अभिन्नत्वमभेदश्च यथा भेदविवर्जितम्।
व्यवहार्यं पृथक् च स्यादेवं सर्वे गुणा हरेः॥
अभेदाभिन्नयोर्भेदो यदि वा भेदभिन्नयोः।
अनवस्थितिरेव स्यान्न विशेषणतामतिः।
मूलसम्बन्धमज्ञात्वा; तस्मादेकमनन्तधा।
व्यवहार्यं विशेषेण; दुस्तर्कबलतो हरेः।
विशेषोऽपि स्वरूपं स स्वनिर्वाहकतास्य च॥ इति ब्रह्मतर्के॥

10. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* i, 9, 43; vi, 5, 84 and *Varāha*, xiv, 41.

11. Cf. आनन्दो विषयानुभवो नित्यत्वं चेति सन्ति धर्माः। अपृथक्त्वेऽपि चैतन्यात् पृथगिवावभासन्ते। (*Pañcapādikā*).

12. "Whatever is in its own nature absolutely inconceivable is nothing" (Ralph. Cudworth).

# CHAPTER V

## THE WORLD AND ITS RELATION TO THE BRAHMAN

### i.

Madhva's conception of the material world and its relation to the Brahman, is free from the difficulties that beset the Pariṇāma and Vivarta-vādins. Pantheism is worse than irreligion. It pulls down the Deity to the gutter. Madhva, therefore rejects the view of Bhāskara and many others that Brahman in itself provides the stuff of which the Universe is made. So far as all our received knowledge and the testimony of the Scriptures go, there would appear to be an unbridgeable gulf between Spirit and Matter: चित् and जड[1]. The Brahman is essentially Saccidānanda. How then, could such a perfect Being of pure intelligence and bliss, evolve out of itself, an effect that is inert and wholly lacking in intelligence and is in addition, the abode of so much misery and subject to ceaseless transformation? There is no use in taking refuge in alleged statements in the śruti to the effect that the Brahman is immediately and in its own person, the material cause of the world. 'For not even the vociferation of a hundred texts can make the crow white'.[2] Reason may test even where it cannot build, and where conflicting authorities claim to interpret the śruti each to suit his own metaphysics, the employment of reason becomes more important than the bare text itself.

Not even Scripture says directly that the intelligent becomes the unintelligent. In that case, the Brahman can as well transform itself into individual souls thus simplifying matters for all philosophers. Moreover, the śruti teaches emphatically that Brahman is immutable and unchanging: Nirvikāra. Since no causation is possible without *some* change or modification in the cause, we *must* naturally look for the material cause of the Universe, elsewhere than in the Brahman.

A strict adherence to the logic of facts and the spirit of the śrutis, compels Madhva to repudiate the profanity of Brahmapariṇāmavāda in any garb. Even the oft-paraded promissory statement about the knowledge of the One leading to the knowledge of the many,

1. नचेतनविकारः स्याद्यत्र क्वापि ह्यचेतनम् ।
नाचेतनविकारोऽपि चेतनः स्यात्कदाचन ॥ (Av., i, 4, p. 13b)

2. Cf. नह्यागमाः सहस्रमपि घटं पटयितुमीशते ॥ (*Bhāmatī* p. 6. Bby. 1917.)

does not *necessarily* warrant the conclusion that the Brahman is the material cause of the Universe. The examples of "mṛtpiṇḍa" 'lohamaṇi' and 'nakhanikṛntana', *in the form in which they appear in the Chān. Up.* vi, 1, 4-6 are virtually incapable of suggesting anything more than some kind of general *resemblance* or point of contact between God and the world. The terms एक (used thrice), पिण्ड, मणि and नखनिकृन्तन *stand in the way* of establishing an intimate causal relation उपादानोपादेयभाव among the pairs named in the text.[3] A little reflection would prove the truth of this contention.[4] There is no use pleading that we should not take in the texts literally but look to their spirit; for the spirit itself is to be deduced from the letter. However that may be, the third and last illustration of the "nail-scissors", *has not even the semblance of a causal argument.*[5] It gives the whole case away. It is in itself an effect and cannot, in the nature of things, be "the cause of

3. अन्यथा 'एक' शब्दः 'पिण्ड' शब्दश्च व्यर्थः स्यात्। मृदा विज्ञातया इत्येतावता पूर्णत्वात्। नह्येकमृत्पिण्डात्मकानि अन्यमृण्मयानि ! सादृश्यमेव हि तेषाम्। नह्येकमण्यात्मकमन्यल्लोहमयम् ! नचैकनखनिकृन्तनात्मकं सर्वं कार्ष्णायसम् ! (Madhva, *VTN*, p. 25b.)

[Otherwise the words "eka" and piṇḍa" would be meaningless. It would be enough to say "By knowing mud" . . . Surely, all that is made of earth is not the result of *one* clod of earth! There can only be a resemblance amongst them. All that is metallic in the world is not the effect of *one* nugget of gold! Nor all that is made of iron, the effects of a single nail-cutter!]

4. जगतो ब्रह्मविकारत्वेन तदारोपत्वेन वा एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञाने विवक्षिते, 'मृदा विज्ञातया मृण्मयं विज्ञातं स्याल्लोहेन विज्ञातेन लोहमयं विज्ञातं स्यात्कार्ष्णायसा विज्ञातेन कार्ष्णायसं विज्ञातं स्यात् इत्येतावता पूर्णत्वात् त्रयाणामेकशब्दानां पिण्डमणिनखनिकृन्तनशब्दानां सर्वशब्दानां च विगतार्थत्वं स्यात्। सर्वमण्यादीनां एकमृत्पिण्ड विकारत्वाभावात् विरुद्धार्थता च स्यात्। (*N.S.*, i, 4, p. 226)

[When the knowledge of the many by the knowledge of the one is posited either in view of the world being a transformation of Brahman or a superimposition on it, the words "eka" (thrice) piṇḍa, maṇi and nakhanikṛntana and "sarvam" would not only be meaningless as the sense would be conveyed even by saying "By knowing mud, all that is made of it is known, by knowing gold all that is made of it is known, by knowing iron all that is of the nature of it is known, but positively misleading.]

5. इदं तु सर्वथानुपपन्नम्। नखनिकृन्तनस्य स्वयमप्यन्त्यावयवित्वेन कार्ष्णायसं प्रति कारणत्वस्यैवाभावात्। किम्वेकस्य सर्वं प्रति ? (N.S., i, 4, 6, p. 226.)

[As for the example of the nail-cutter it is *utterly absurd* as the nail-cutter is itself an effect (and last in the scale) and not one nail-cutter can be said to be the cause (material) of iron. Much less that it is the cause of all that is made of iron!]

all that is made of kṛṣṇāyas". It should be clear then, that the argument to the material causality of the Brahman breaks down completely and at the very first touch, in this instance. The position is hardly better in the other two.

It would be far more reasonable to assume that the object of the three illustrations is merely to insist on the primacy of knowledge of the Brahman over all other knowledge. To know God is to know at one sweep, the world that is His and is so entirely dependent upon Him.[6] यज्ज्ञात्वा नेह भूयोऽन्यज्ज्ञातव्यमवशिष्यते (Gītā vii, 2). For the knowledge of God is the end and aim of life, the cream and culmination of all wisdom. Sage Uddālaka is naturally at pains to impress this fundamental truth upon his boy who is conceited enough (स्तब्ध एयाय) to glory in his learning of a kind divorced from God-vision.

An interpretation such as this has no doubt many attractive features; but it has got its own difficulties in correlation. While there is much truth in Madhva's contention that a relation of material cause and effect could not be established among the pairs named by Uddālaka, (if regard be had to the actual manner of wording), it cannot be denied that in each case, the pairs belong to one and the same species, which renders 'Ekavijñānena sarvavijñānam' possible. It is doubtful if such an affinity could ever be established by Madhva between God and the world. There is however little difficulty in the case of the souls which are all sentient and belong like God to the class of Ātman having the attributes of Sat-cit and ānanda in common. It may not be so easy to establish a like connection between God and the world, whose only affinity with the Brahman is that of existence and reality.[7] A closer bond between the two would be impossible without positing the metaphysical dependence of the material world on God. Madhva could afford to concede that also: cf. इदं हि विश्वं भगवानिवेतरो यतो जगत्स्थाननिरोधसंभवः । (Bhāg. i, 5, 20)

And his comment thereon: इतरोऽपि भगवान् विश्वमिव; स्वातन्त्र्यात् ।

6. प्रधानज्ञानादप्रधानस्य ज्ञातवद्व्यपदेशोऽस्त्येव । कारणे च पितरि ज्ञाते पुत्रो ज्ञात इति । एवमत्रापि एतत्सृष्टं सर्वमित्यादि । (Madhva, *VTN*) Cf. also यथैकेन मृत्पिण्डेनेत्यादि दृष्टान्तः परमात्मनः प्राधान्यं सूचयतः यथा सोमशर्मणैकेन ज्ञातेन सर्वे कठा ज्ञाता भवन्ति । *Bhāmatī*, p. 425, in the pūrvapakṣa.

7. Cf. Śaṁkara on B.S. ii, 1, 6:

दृश्यते हि सत्तालक्षणो ब्रह्मस्वभाव आकाशादिष्वनुवर्तमान इत्युक्तम् ॥

The other familiar examples of (1) scorpions being produced from cowdung; (2) hair and nails from the human body; and (3) the growth of man from childhood and youth to old age,—quoted to establish the material causality of Brahman, are all equally unavailing. The point at issue is the possibility of an unintelligent (jaḍa) effect being produced *solely* from a sentient source. The analogy of scorpions is therefore doubly irrelevant as the scorpion is a living creature and the dung insentient.[8] The growth of hair and nails from the human body is possible only so long as it is tenanted and sustained by a soul and not at other times. But the Pariṇāmavādin has necessarily to conceive of a state when Brahma-caitanya alone existed in an incorporeal or pre-corporeal state and *later on* produced the material world out of itself. But a disembodied Brahman cannot on the very same analogy of man, produce anything. It would in any case be impossible to show that nails and hair are directly produced from the soul. The example of the development of man from childhood to old age pertains, in the opinion of all Śāstrakāras, only to the body (śarīradharma) of man not to his soul. The ripening of wisdom with the advance of years and the appearance of virility in youth are all possible only in the event of a body sustained by the presence of a soul. None of the developments can or is known to take place in the *soul as such*. And in all these cases, the purely physical developments are always attributable to the physical part in the causal complement.[9] Consistent then, with the implications of these analogies, the Pariṇāmavādin must admit that the purely material part of Brahman—if ever it has or can be said to have any—is the material cause of the world[10] and that the soul-part or spiritual element in its make-up, is the operative Cause.[11] That would be tantamount to a restatement of the position of Madhva in less rigorous phraseology.

8. Even if such production were biologically true, it admits of other explanation, in so far as the scorpion has a material body which may be derived from the dung. But the soul of the scorpion (in so far as it may have one!), cannot be a product of cowdung. Śamkara's explanation (B.S. ii, 1, 6) that the Brahman has *sattā*, in common with its effects like Ākāśa, overlooks the fact that this *sattā* is not like the body of man, distinguishable from the Brahman!

9. पित्रादिदृष्टान्तानामयं खलु निष्कृष्टोऽर्थः—यत् पित्राद्युपभुक्तमन्नं तच्छरीरभूतं पुत्रादिगताचेतनांशोपादानं भवतीति । पक्षान्तरस्यासंभावितत्वात् । (NS. i, p. 197)

10. भागेन परिणामश्चेत् भागयोर्भेद एवहि ।
यो भागो न विकारी स्यात्स एवास्माकमीश्वरः ॥ (Av. i, 13b.)

11. In such a contingency, the material part would have to be regarded as not-

In so far as most Pariṇāmavādins like Bhāskara and Śrīkaṇṭha do not admit the co-existence of a purely material principle (Prakṛti) which can figuratively be styled the body of God, the illustration of scorpions, etc., cannot reasonably be cited by them. Bhāskara is the only Vedāntin who holds fearlessly to actual Brahmapariṇāma and regards not merely the material world, but the souls as well, as products of Brahman. This lands him in further difficulty of having to visit the miseries of the finite selves also, on the Brahman, contrary to the repeated protests of the Upaniṣads ( अनश्नन्न्योऽभिचाकशीत and the Sūtra : संभोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न i, 2, 8.) .

Rāmānuja however cannot afford to go to the same length as Bhāskara and *deny* the existence of a purely material principle called Prakṛti, co-existent with Brahman though subject to it and acting as its body (यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरम्). The so-called Brahmopādānatva on *his* view, is on a par with the procreation of the son (i.e. his body), by the father or the emergence of nails and hair from the body nurtured by food :—

अपादानत्वमेवास्य यद्युपादानता भवेत् ।
अङ्गीकृतं तत् पितृवन्नैव विश्वात्मना भवः ॥

(Madhva, Av. i. p. 12.)

[If by saying that God is the material cause of the Universe you mean that He is merely the residual Spirit that remains unaffected and untransforming in any given instance of change in its tenement, we agree to *such* Upādānatva (material causality) which is on a par with the causality of the father in regard to his son.]

Even the position of Śrīkaṇṭha and other (Brahma)-Śaktipariṇāmavādins, like Nimbārka, Vallabha and others, is hardly better. In so far as this (Cit-)śakti of Brahman, which according to these writers, is the immediate substratum of Pariṇāma, is distinguished from the soul-part of Brahman conceived as Saccidānandātmaka, the latter ceases to be the real substratum of the change. It is this *Cicchakti*,[12] śakti or energy or

Brahman—as there can obviously be nothing material about the Brahman. This would give us but a Kevala-nimittakāraṇa in the end.

12. The phrase is peculiar to Śrīkaṇṭha. Cit-śakti, on his view, is conceived as Cidacit-prapañcakāra. It is sometimes identified with the Brahman and sometimes distinguished—a loose procedure, no doubt.

"body" of God (as Rāmānuja calls it) that turns out to be the *real* and immediate material cause of the world. Even this is a far cry from the actual and immediate Upādānatva or Pariṇāmitva of Brahman,[13] being in effect, no more than a feeble imitation of and a poor apology for it. Thus, in most cases, the so-called Upādānatva of God, turns out, on closer examination, to be nothing more than an "Apādānatva" अपायावधित्वलक्षणम्—the residual Spirit that remains unaffected and untransforming in any given instance of change taking place in its tenement. Shorn of the metaphors of "body", "Cit-śakti",

13. Cf. the following brilliant analysis by Jayatīrtha (N.S. i, 200):—

अथ मतम्—द्विरूपं ब्रह्माभ्युपगम्यते अनन्तानन्दचिदात्मकं सदात्मकं चेति। तत्राद्येन रूपेण निमित्तं द्वितीयेनोपादानम्। अतो न कश्चिद्दोषः निर्विकारित्वं चिच्छक्तिविषयत्वाददूषणम्। तेन, सच्छक्तिकं ब्रह्म परिणमतीत्यङ्गीकारे न युक्तिविरोधोऽपि ... ...। यदि ब्रह्मणः सद्भागेन परिणामः चिद्भागेन निर्विकारित्वमङ्गीक्रियते तदा वक्तव्यम्—तयोर्भागयोरभेदो भेदाभेदो वा? न तावदभेदः; द्वयोरपि परिणामित्वापत्त्या भागद्वयकल्पनावैयर्थ्यात्। नापि भेदाभेदौ। अभेदेन सङ्करप्रसङ्गात्। भेदोऽभेदकार्यं निरुणद्धाति चेत्; किं तर्ह्यभेदेनाप्रयोजकेन? तस्माद्भागयोरत्यन्तभेद एवाङ्गीकार्यः। ततः किमित्यत आह—यो भाग इति। परस्परमत्यन्तभिन्ने द्वे वस्तुनी। तत्रैकं निर्विकारं जगन्निमित्तमेव। अपरं परिणामि जगदुपादानमेवेत्यङ्गीकारे नेश्वरस्य केवलनिमित्तवादिनामस्माकं कश्चिद्विरोधः। निर्विकारस्य जगन्निमित्तस्यास्माभिरीश्वरत्वेन, परिणामिनो जगदुपादानस्य प्रधानत्वेन चाङ्गीकृतत्वात्। अत्र 'यो भाग' इति पराभ्युपगमेनोक्तम्। स्वमतेन तु यद्वस्तु इति ज्ञातव्यम्॥ This criticism though not expressly directed against Śrīkaṇṭha, covers his position also admirably, as indeed of every other variety of शाक्तपरिणामवाद.

[If you think—"There are two aspects of the Brahman. One that is essentially blissful and of the nature of Cit, the other of the nature of "Sat". (existence). It is efficient cause in the former aspect and material cause in the latter. The immutability of Brahman is thus to be understood with reference to the former aspect. There is no clash with logic in thus submitting that the Brahman in its aspect of Sat, transforms itself into the material world. ......"

The advocates of such a position will have to say if these two aspects are identical with each other or are partly different and partly identical. They cannot be identical as both will have to transform. Nor can they be different—and identical. For at least in respect of identity there will be the same nemesis. If it is argued that the difference would prevent the identity from bringing about the said nemesis, why not dispense with the identity that is so palpably powerless against the difference?

Therefore it must be conceded that the two aspects are entirely different. It thus comes to this that there are two different entities, one of which is essentially immutable and acting as the operative cause alone of the Universe. The other one is liable to transformation and acts as the material

"śakti", *et hoc*, the Pariṇāmavāda of most commentators on the Vedānta, is little more than (Kevala-) nimitta-kāraṇavāda—just a bombastic and a periphrastic statement of the latter, a simple case of *pure* Nimitta-kāraṇavāda *writ larger* as "Abhinnanimittopādānakāraṇavāda"! This is made perfectly clear, by Jayatīrtha, in a masterly review of the position of Rāmānuja:

अत्र कश्चिदन्धानुगतान्ध इव प्रकृतिश्चेत्यादीनि सूत्राणि ब्रह्मणो जगदुपादानप्रतिपादकतया व्याख्यायोक्तदूषणगणाद्भीतः सूत्रतात्पर्यमेवमाह—परमसूक्ष्माचित्प्रधानशरीरं ब्रह्म 'योऽव्यक्ते तिष्ठन् यस्याव्यक्तं शरीरं' इत्यादि श्रुतिसिद्धम्। तथा च ब्रह्माधिष्ठितं ब्रह्मात्मकं प्रधानं जगदुपादानमिति ब्रह्मैव जगदुपादानतयाङ्गीक्रियते। अतो नोक्तदोष इति। तं प्रत्याह—अपादानत्वमेवेति ॥

एवं हि वदता, पितुरिव पुत्रजन्मनि, जगदुत्पत्तौ ब्रह्मणोऽप्यवधित्वलक्षणमेवोपादानत्वमिष्टं स्यात्। सर्वथा निर्विकारस्य ब्रह्मणो विकारिप्रधानशरीरकस्य तदधिष्ठातृत्वेनोपादानतयोदितत्वात्—एवंभूतं चोपादानत्वं ब्रह्मणोऽस्माभिरप्यङ्गीकृतमेवेति नात्रास्माकं प्रद्वेषः।

नन्वङ्गीकृतं चेदुपादानत्वं ब्रह्मणः, कथं तर्हि तन्निराकरणम्? इत्यत आह—"नत्विति।" शुद्धचैतन्यस्यैव ब्रह्मणो विश्वात्मना भवः भास्कराद्यङ्गीकृतः नास्माभिरङ्गीक्रियते। अतस्तन्निराकरणमुपपन्नमेवेति।

अत्रायमभिसन्धिः—यद्यपि परव्युत्पादितं ब्रह्मणो जगदुपादानत्वं नास्माकमर्थतो विरोधि, तथापि, नैतेषां सूत्राणामर्थः। तथा हि—किमत्रास्य व्युत्पादनस्य प्रयोजनम्? न तावद्भास्करस्येव निमित्तोपादानभेदनिराकरणम्; प्रधानस्योपादानतयाङ्गीकृतत्वात्।[13a]

cause of the world. If this were so, we who are advocates of the view that God is the operative cause only, of the Universe, have no reason to quarrel with you. For according to us God is that which is immutable and is the efficient cause of the origin, etc., of the world. What actually transforms and acts as the material cause of the world is designated by us as Pradhāna (Matter). In the above discussion, the term "part" or "aspect" should be understood to have been used from the point of view of the other party. From our point of view the proper term would be "Entity".]

13a. cf. न वयमव्यक्तं तत्परिणामविशेषांश्च स्वरूपेण नाभ्युपगच्छामः। अपि तु, परमपुरुषशरीरतया तदात्मकत्वविरहेण। तथानभ्युपगमादेव तन्त्रसिद्धप्रक्रियानिरसनम्। अत्रापि तन्त्रसिद्धप्रक्रिया निरस्यते। न ब्रह्मात्मकानां प्रकृतिमहदहङ्काराणां स्वरूपम् ॥ *Śrībhāṣya*, I.4.3.

विकारिवस्त्वधिष्ठातृत्वमेव मुख्यमुपादानत्वमिति चेत्; न। लोकविरोधात्। लोकव्यवहारानुसारेणैव हि परीक्षकैर्लक्षणं कार्यम्! न स्वाभिप्रायेण लोकव्यवहारो नियन्तव्यः ॥ (*Nyāyasudhā*, i. 4, p. 197b). See also the Introduction to my Catussūtri-bhāṣya of Madhva, p. xxii, xxiii, for an exposition of this criticism.

This would make clear how poor an apology and how lame a substitute for the real redolent Brahmapariṇāmavāda, Rāmānuja's theory is. There is nothing of the substance of real Brahmapariṇāmavāda in it, save a loose and unscientific use of the *terminology* of Brahmopādānavāda.

As for the Vivarta-vāda, it is, strictly speaking, no theory of causality at all, as on that view, there is no causation at all—no world to be accounted for: न निरोधो न चोत्पत्तिः (*Gauḍapāda Kārikā* ii, 31). Quite apart from the difficulty of *accounting* for the obscuration of the Brahman by Ajñāna,[14] which is the root-cause of world-appearance, there is greater difficulty than even on the Pariṇāmavāda interpretation, in reconciling the promissory statement of the Śruti regarding एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानम् with the illustrations of clay, etc., and the requirements of *real* Vivartavāda.[15] It would, in the first place, be truer to say from this (Vivarta) point of view that the knowledge of the one *sublates* or destroys the knowledge of the many, rather than that it *produces* or *gives rise* (अश्रुतं श्रुतं भवति) to a knowledge of the many. The expressions used by Uddālaka are not merely inappropriate to the Vivarta point of view but capable of suggesting a different interpretation altogether. There is nothing to show that Uddālaka was trying to equate the many with the unreal. The unreal is that something which has been mistaken for another:—*Cf.* कोऽयमध्यासो नाम? अतस्मिंस्तद्बुद्धिरित्यवोचाम (Śaṁkara, B.S.B.). But the "many" in the promissory statement includes also things which have not at all been hitherto brought within the scope of Śvetaketu's

14. यच्चाविकृतमेवैकं ब्रह्म विश्वात्मना मृषा।
दृश्यते मन्ददृष्ट्यैव स सर्ग इति कथ्यते ॥
स मन्ददृष्टिः तस्यैव ब्रह्मणः किं ततोऽन्यगा?
ब्रह्मणश्चेत् क्व सार्वज्ञं? अन्यगा चेत्ततोऽन्यता। (AV. i, 4, 13b.)

15. आरोपितत्वं तु, एकस्यापि मृण्मयस्यैकस्मिन्मृत्पिण्डे नास्ति; किमुत सर्वस्य! युक्त्या समर्थ्यत इति चेत्; तर्हि विवादपदत्वेन दृष्टान्तानुपपत्तेः। 'लौकिकपरीक्षकाणां यस्मिन्नर्थे बुद्धिसाम्यं स दृष्टान्तः' इति हि न्यायविदः ॥ (NS. i, 4, 6, p. 226.)

understanding *or misunderstanding* : Cf. अश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातम् । In any case, the illustrations of clay, etc, would appear to assume the reality of effects, the connecting link between the One and the many being nothing more than a general Sādṛśya. Clay is never the Vivartopādāna of pots. Since no causal relation can be made out among the pairs mentioned in the text, without distorting the actual wording and asserting a palpable travesty in the last instance of Nakhanikṛntana, the interpretations of both Śamkara[16] and Rāmānuja would seem to be misplaced.

## CHAPTER VI.

### PRAKṚTI'S ENTITY NEITHER MYTHICAL NOR UNŚĀSTRAIC

It would doubtless be asked, why if the Brahmapariṇāmavāda were so untenable, the Sūtrakāra should have been at so much pains to uphold it in his work ? Madhva denies, boldly, that he has done anything of the kind. There is no proof in the Sūtras that Bādarāyaṇa actually taught the Brahmapariṇāmavāda. To many such a view may appear startling. Doubtless, Madhva could as well have escaped with the admission that the Sūtrakāra teaches or means to teach only *such* Pariṇāma of Brahman as has been adumbrated by Rāmānuja, which we have seen, is no more than a nominal one.[1] But that would merely have shelved the question whether the Sūtrakāra *does* or *does not* concede the existence of a separate material principle *other than* the Brahman and corresponding to the Prakṛti of the Sāmkhya, that provides the stuff of which the material world is made ; and if so, what according to him, is the *status* of that principle,—whether it is *independent* of the Brahman, or is a creation of it, or else, both co-existent with and dependent upon it ?

16. So long as this difficulty persists, nothing could be gained by holding to Sarvajñātman's special pleading :

विवर्तवादस्य हि पूर्वभूमिः ... ... ।
व्यवस्थितेऽस्मिन्परिणामवादे स्वयं समायाति विवर्तवादः ॥
(*Samkṣepaśārīraka*, ii, 61.)

that Vivarta and Pariṇāma are not really so different and inimical to each other, but that the latter is a preliminary to the former or that it is a "development rather than a negation" of the latter. परिणाम assumes real modification which विवर्त denies.

1. Cf. *ante* एवंभूतं च ब्रह्मणो जगदुपादानत्वमस्माभिरप्यङ्गीकृतमेवेति नात्रास्माकं प्रद्वेषः । (NS.)
अपादानत्वमेवास्य यद्युपादानता भवेत् ।
अङ्गीकृतं तत्पितृवत् । (Av. i, 4)

Madhva faces this question which is so vital to Hindu philosophy, not merely with special reference to the Sūtras, but to the entire literature of the Vedas, Upaniṣads and Epics. It is this spirit of fidelity to the bulk of the received literature and anxiety to propound a philosophy that would cover and do justice to the whole of it, that distinguishes him from other commentators on the Vedānta.

We shall start our investigation of this issue with reference to the few sūtras which are generally believed to repudiate the concept of Prakṛti and affirm the Brahman itself to be the sole and whole cause, both material and operative, of the Universe. The relevant contexts in the Sūtras may thus be briefly indicated :—

(1) ईक्षत्यधिकरणम् ; (2) प्रकृतिश्च........ (3) तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्य : (4) आनुमानिकमप्येकेषाम् and (5) रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम्.

Now, it is agreed on all hands that the Sūtrakāra has severely criticised the metaphysics of the Sāmkhyas, in his work. But what precisely is the point at issue between him and the Sāmkhyas ? Before answering this question, it would be well to state the fundamental position of the Sāmkhya metaphysics. It is admittedly agnostic if not also atheistic. The Sāmkhya recognises but two ultimate principles : Prakṛti and Puruṣas. Prakṛti is directly the cause of the evolution of the material world from a subtle to a gross state. She is conceived to be essentially unintelligent and virtually *independent* of the Puruṣas, though co-operating with them for *their* welfare. The Sāmkhya has thus no use for a creator-God (Brahman) such as the Sūtrakāra is enamoured of : जन्माद्यस्य यतः। The point at issue would thus be the philosophical necessity of recognising an intelligent Cause, such as the Brahman, for the world.

A little attention now to the ईक्षत्यधिकरण even as interpreted by Śamkara would show that the Sūtrakāra is fighting for the recognition of such an intelligent principle as the Cause of the World—in other words for a Nimittakāraṇa. This is clear from his emphasis on the attribute of ईक्षितृत्व purposive willing, which is a pre-condition of creation—ईक्षितृत्वात्कारणस्य। The Sāmkhya Pradhāna being avowedly insentient, cannot operate as a discerning Cause ईक्षितृ कारणम्। and cannot therefore be admitted as the ultimate cause of the world. That the Sūtrakāra is here thinking only of an operative cause is also clear from a later sūtra : रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम् (ii, 2, 1) and Śamkara's comment

on it :— कथमचेतनं प्रधानं रचयेत् and again, (प्रवृत्तिरपि) नाचेतनस्य प्रधानस्य स्वतन्त्रस्योपपद्यते ।। (ii, 2, 2).

Though it could not follow from this that the Sūtrakāra was loth to using the term " cause ", with reference to a purely material cause, such as alone the Pradhāna could be, the inference would be quite legitimate that he was in i, 1, 5, conceiving of the Brahman, simply as the Nimittakāraṇa of the world. If he had thought it possible that it was *also* the material cause, he does not say so *in the present context*. At any rate, we will have to look for a clearer statement on that issue, elsewhere. The sense of the Īkṣatyadhikaraṇa would be complete ( चरितार्थ ) even as referring to a Nimittakāraṇa alone. If Śaṁkara could argue from the logical point of view that the ultimate cause of the world cannot be an insentient thing, the Sāmkhya would equally logically point out that conversely no sentient being can be the material cause with reference to another object, and that to that extent his Abhinnanimittopādāna is weakened.

The only answer Śaṁkara gives to this objection is an appeal to the Śāstra. This is hardly convincing since *even he* is not prepared to swallow everything that the Śāstra has got to say. Were he so, there is hardly any need for the *Bhāmatī* under B.S. i, 4, 27, to shy at the acceptance of an actual Brahmapariṇāma which is admitted to be the literal sense of the śruti and the sūtra (i, 4, 27) and prevaricate by saying that what they really mean to teach is the Vivartopādānatva of the Brahman through the backdoor of Pariṇāma, and not an actual Pariṇāma into the form of the material world, in view of the unchanging nature of the Brahman.[2]

Apart however from this *tour de force* of Vācaspati, the interpretation of the Prakṛtyadhikaraṇa, in terms of the material causality of the Brahman is beside the mark, in so far as the illustrations used in the text, do not, as already pointed out, lend themselves to the requirements of Pariṇāmavāda. By a strange irony of fate, there is more of दृष्टान्तोपरोध (conflict with the illustrations) than its contrary: दृष्टान्तानुपरोध

2. इयं चोपादानपरिणामादिभाषा न विकाराभिप्रायेण । अपि तु, यथा सर्पस्योपादानं रज्जुः एवं ब्रह्म जगदुपादानं द्रष्टव्यम् । न खलु निरंशस्य निष्कलस्य ब्रह्मणः सर्वात्मनैकदेशेन वा परिणामः संभवति ।। (i, 4, 27) Why not, when the śruti teaches it : सच्च त्यच्चाभवत् । It would be well to remember that " Pariṇāma " assumes a real transformation, which Vivarta denies. The two views are thus as poles asunder.

(B.S. i, 4, 27) if the illustrations are sought to be correlated to a Pariṇāmavāda. It is worse still, if with the Vivartavāda.

This conflict with the illustrations naturally continues in the तदनन्यत्वाधिकरण । also (as interpreted by Śaṁkara and Rāmānuja) where also, the विषयवाक्य happens to be the same text from the *Chāndogya*: एकेन मृत्पिण्डेन etc.

There is thus, not a single sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa which can be taken to support the doctrine of actual Brahmapariṇāma, (in lieu of Prakṛti-Pariṇāma), without reserve or ambiguity. In the absence of any such indubitable support, it may as well be assumed that he does *not* countenance the view.

ii

The repeated criticism of the Sāmkhya metaphysics should not therefore, mislead us into thinking that the Sūtrakāra has forever banished the Prakṛti from *his* metaphysics, or that he denies that the concept of Prakṛti has any place in the philosophical literature of the Hindus (अशब्दम्[3]) The आनुमानिक and some other sūtras may appear to support such a conclusion. But it would not be justified. Since the Prakṛtyadhikarṇa cannot (as we have seen) be correlated to any doctrine of causality; it must with due regard to the context: Samanvayādhyāya, be taken merely as attempting the attunement of such (feminine) names as प्रकृति योनि etc., in Brahman, as of Ākāśa., Akṣara, etc., in an earlier context. The Ānumānika-sūtra i, 4,1; also

3. Such is no doubt the opinion of Śamkara. But it is baseless. Rāmānuja has even less justification to dismiss the Prakṛti as Āśabdam as he grants the reality of Matter. Cf. न वयमव्यक्तं तत्परिणामविशेषांश्च स्वरूपेण नाभ्युपगच्छामः। अत्रापि तन्त्र सिद्धप्रक्रिया निरस्यते ; न ब्रह्मात्मकानां प्रकृतिमहदहङ्काराणां स्वरूपम् ॥ (*Śrībhāṣya* I.4.3) | It may not be independent of God but then neither are the souls so. One cannot on that account, dismiss the souls as Aśabdam! Madhva takes B.S. i, 1, 5, to refute the doctrine of the Avācyatva of Brahman:— अशब्दं शब्दवाच्यं न। Even if one prefers to take it as a refutation of the Sāmkhya, Aśabdam may be treated as a technical equivalent of Pradhāna: that which is established by the Sāmkhya, primarily by Inference. शब्दाभिन्नमनुमानं अशब्दः। तन्मुख्यप्रमाणकमशब्दमानुमानिकमित्यनर्थान्तरम् Cf. *Sāṁkhya Kārikā*, 15-16.

ought to be and is, capable of being so treated, for an identical reason.[4] In the next adhikaraṇa: चमसवदविशेषात् (i, 4, 8), Śaṁkara is equally anxious to deny that a material principle corresponding to the Ṣāmkhya-Prakṛti, and having its essential characteristics (of three guṇas) is anywhere taught in the whole range of Śāstras. The Ṣāmkhya puts up in his favour the Śvetāśvatara text: अजामेकां लोहितशुक्लकृष्णाम् । Śaṁkara tries to elude his adversary and ends by equating the अजा of this text, with the triple elements पृथिव्यप्तेजस् in their subtle state (भूतसूक्ष्म) तेजोऽबन्नलक्षणा. He further contends that this latter is identical with the Māyā-śakti of Īśvara, which is inanimate (भूतसूक्ष्म) and dependent on Him: परमेश्वराधीना ; न स्वतन्त्रा (Śamkara) and that in any case, अजामेकाम् gives no quarter to the Sāmkhya Prakṛti.

Now, in so far as Śaṁkara has not cared to identify this भूतसूक्ष्म with the Brahman, but has freely admitted that these three elements are essentially unintelligent both in their gross and subtle forms, the distinction of such भूतसूक्ष्म from the Prakṛti of the Sāmkhyas is without a difference. If the monist could admit a material principle माया *other than* the Brahman (though subject to it), as providing the stuff of which the world is made, why should he unnecessarily fly at the throat of the Samkhya, for asserting an identical principle under a different name,[5]—a name which is also current in the Upaniṣads. If the objection is to the independence of this Prakṛti, as Śaṁkara's protests would appear to signify, his position turns out to be identical with that of Madhva. But then, there could be hardly any reason or justification for seeking to dismiss the Prakṛti as being outside the pale of

4. It may be pointed out in passing that Śaṁkara is at his wit's end here, to find a suitable correlate (अभिधेय) for the term Avyakta (Katha, 1, 3, 11) which he identifies with the "human body"—śarīram—despite the glaring fact of its being only too clearly visible and manifested (Vyakta), instead of being subtle and unmanifested as required by the Sūtra: सूक्ष्मं तु तदर्हत्वात् । (i,4,2) and by the sense of the term "Avyakta".

5. अनादेरुपादानस्य जडस्य भूतसूक्ष्मशब्दाभिधेयस्याङ्गीकारे, प्रधानं नेति रिक्तं वचः । तल्लक्षणत्वात्प्रधानस्य । नाम्नि विवादायोगादिति भावः ॥ (N. S.)

[If you admit a beginningless material principle to be designated by the term "subtle element", what is the fun of saying that you don't admit Matter? For the same characteristic is possessed by Matter and the difference in name is nothing.]

Hindu Śāstras, and having no status or *locus standi* whatever, therein! It would be too much for anyone to eat the cake and yet try to have it.[6]

iii

There are plenty of texts in the Śāstras, attesting the existence of Prakṛti as a material principle acting as the material cause of the world and Madhva has cited a few of them,[7] to show how sweeping and mistaken Śaṁkara and other commentators are, in dismissing the Prakṛti as "Aśabdam", by a mere stroke of their pen. Every student of the *Mahābhārata* knows that the Epic and the Purāṇic Sāmkhya have long ago recognised the Prakṛti as co-existing with Īśvara and transforming itself at the direction of the Lord:— ,

तस्मादव्यक्तमुत्पन्नं त्रिगुणं द्विजसत्तम । (*Mbh.* xii, 347, 31)

प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चापि विद्ध्यनादी उभावपि ॥ (*Gītā,* XIII, 19.)

6. Cf. जगत्कारणत्वेन खल्वत्राजा प्रतीयते। सा ब्रह्मवादिना ब्रह्मपरतया समर्थनीया। तेजोऽबन्नात्मकतया समर्थनेऽतिव्याप्तेः तुल्यत्वादिति। तेजोऽबन्नान्यपि परमात्माधीनानि। अतो नात्रातिव्याप्तिरिति चेत्; एवं तर्हि किं मन्त्रस्य प्रकृतिपरत्वनिराकरणेन? किं तु, प्रकृतिपरत्त्वमङ्गीकृत्य 'यो योनिमधितिष्ठत्येकः (*Śvet. Up.* 4-11) इत्यादि वाक्यबलेन ईश्वराधीनत्वमेवोपपादनीयम्। किं च तेजऽबन्नेषु न तावदजाशब्दो रूढः। नापि यौगिकः। तत्तेजोऽसृजत (*Chān. Up.* vi, 2, 3) इति श्रुतेः अजनानासंभवात्। नच स्त्रीलिङ्गत्वमुपपद्यते; नाप्येकवचनम्। त्रिवृत्करणादिति चेन्न; बहुत्वानिवृत्तेः॥ (NS. i, p. 193.)

[An unborn principle appears to be the cause of the world. The Brahmavādin, if he were really thoroughgoing, must equate it with Brahman. If he could identify it with "fire, water and food" why could it not be accepted in the form of Prakṛti itself? For in any case, the definition of Brahman as the cause of the world would be wide of the mark and apply to another also. If you say that there can be no such fear as "Tejas Ap and Anna" are in turn subject to Brahman and that therefore there can be no over-pervasion of the definition, we ask why in that case, you should have been so very solicitous about establishing that the mantra "Ajām ekām" has no reference to Prakṛti. Why not admit that it refers to Prakṛti, but that the Prakṛti itself is not an independent principle as can be seen from such texts as "Yo yonim......"|| Moreover the term Ajā is not an established synonym of "Tejobanna". Nor can it be regarded as etymologically so. They cannot be "Unborn" in view of the Śruti— It created "Tejas...... ". So also, the use of the feminine is incompatible. So too, the singular.]

7. *Anuvyākhyāna,* i, 4, p. 12.

यत्तत्त्रिगुणमव्यक्तमविशेषं विशेषवत् ।
प्रधानं प्रकृतिं प्राहुर्नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् ॥ (*Bhāgavata*, III, 27, 1.)

पञ्चभिः पञ्चभिः ब्रह्म चतुर्भिर्दशभिस्तथा ।
एतच्चतुर्विंशतिकं गणं प्राधानिकं विदुः ॥ (*Bhāg.*, III, 26, 11.)

प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव प्रविश्याशु महेश्वरः ।
चोदयामास सम्प्राप्ते सर्गकाले व्ययाव्ययौ ॥
(*Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, I, 2, 29.)

Texts from the Upaniṣads are not wanting:

गौरनाद्यन्तवती सा जनित्री भूतभाविनी ।
सितासिता च रक्ता च सर्वकामदुघा विभोः[7a] ॥ (*Cūlikā*, 5.)

विकारजननीमज्ञामष्टरूपां ध्रुवामजाम् ।
ध्यायते ध्यासिता तेन तन्यते प्रेर्यतेऽपि च ॥ (*Cūḷikopaniṣad*, 3)

अजामेकां .... .... .... .... । (*Śvet. Up.*, IV, 5.)

ज्ञाज्ञौ द्वावजौ.... .... .... .... । (*Ibid.*, I, 9.)

प्रधानक्षेत्रपतिर्गुणेशः .... .... .... । (*Ibid.*, VI, 16.)

It can never be that the Sūtrakāra was unaware of such overwhelming support to Prakṛti in the sacred literature, or refused to attach any importance to it.[8] If in spite of his awareness of the Śāstraic character of Prakṛti, he was still bent upon a crusade against the Sāmkhyas, his only conceivable reason for so doing, must have been his unwillingness to concede to the Prakṛti the *independence* that was being claimed for it by the Sāmkhyas. Else, there would be two independent principles in his system. A Prakṛti that is *ex hypothesi* dependent on Brahman and acts at its direction, would never lead to a plurality of causes; for the latter alone would be the ultimate Cause in all cases.[9] Madhva's position thus preserves the transcendence and

7a. Quoted (N. S. p. 192).
8. To equate it with Māyā would serve no useful purpose, so long as its entity itself is assumed under whatever name.
9. Vide Śruti cited by Madhva under B.S.B. i, 4, 27.

immutability of the Brahman which are alike in jeopardy on the Pariṇāma view, and invests the causality of the world with proper significance, denied by the Vivartavāda.

## CHAPTER VII

## CREATION.

The material creation, according to Madhva, is neither an emanation (pariṇāma) of the Brahman, nor a production *de novo*. It is merely an actualisation of what is in the womb of Matter and souls by the action of the Brahman. This creation is a reminder, however inadequate, of the majesty of God[1]: बहुचित्रजगद्बहुधा कारणात्परशक्तिरनन्तगुणः परमः। (*Dvādaśa stotra,* IV, 3). However vivid and profound a man's religious consciousness may be, he can only be conscious of God through His manifestations and working in the Universe. Creation gives us a glimpse into the majesty of God: भीषास्माद्वातः पवते (Taitt. Up. ii, 8). And as already pointed out, there is a benevolent purpose behind God's creation,—that of helping souls to realise their full stature.

Madhva is aware that Creation as an *event* occurring at a specific date in the past, at the fiat of the Deity, is open to numerous difficulties and inconsistencies. The awkward question at once arises as to what induced the Deity which kept in its shell all the time, to suddenly take it into its head to come out and call a Universe into being? The objections apply in the first place to creation *ex nihilo*. No Vedāntin subscribes to such a view. The hypothesis of creation in time and the argument to the existence of God from the supposed necessity of a prius to the temporal series, are definitely abandoned by Madhva. Creation to him is no doubt a real process. But it is a continuous creation,—a constant dependence of the world on the Supreme. In so far as "creation", is only the starting point in a process (of eightfold determinations), Madhva would, in a sense, endorse the view of Ulirici that "God is *not first God* and *then* the Creator of the world; but *as*

1. सृष्टिश्च प्राधान्यार्थमत्रोच्यते। (Madhva, Chān. Up. B. vi, 1) and in this connection contrast the antitheistic remarks of Śaṁkara under (B. S. B. I.4, 14) नहि तत्प्रतिबद्धः कश्चित्पुरुषार्थो दृश्यते ; श्रूयते वा। and its refutation by Jayatirtha:— अपुरुषार्थत्वान्न प्रपञ्चसत्यतायां तात्पर्यमिति चेत् ; न। सत्यजगन्निर्मातृत्वादिपारमेश्वरमाहात्म्यज्ञानस्यैव पुरुषार्थहेतुत्वात्। (*NS.* 1. 4. p. 210).

God He is creator and only *as* Creator" (or as responsible for any other determination in the series, Madhva would put in) He is God. This would not be tantamount to a tying down of the Deity as the various attributes are part of his own nature: "Sva-lakṣaṇa" and there could be no limitation of His self and this creative energy of God has a dual aspect of Śakti and Vyakti to be exercised as occasion demands it :—

अनित्यत्वात्क्रियाणां तु कुत एव स्वरूपता ?
इति चेत्स विशेषोऽपि क्रियाशक्त्यात्मना स्थितः ।
शक्तिता व्यक्तिता चेति विशेषोऽपि विशेषवान् ॥ Av. i, 2, p. 9.)

Cf. also Av., ii, 2, verses 171-77.

Madhva uses the term "cause" in the sense that a world of imperfect beings, and of ceaseless change, is explicable only as maintained by and dependent upon a Supreme Being who is Himself unchanging and perfect in every way and whose constant presence 'educes' the series of forms latent in Matter and brings the souls nearer to their self-development, at every step, and so brings them into full play and actual manifestation :—

बलमानन्द ओजश्च सहो ज्ञानमनाकुलम् ।
स्वरूपाण्येव जीवस्य व्यज्यन्ते परमाद्विभोः ॥
(B.S.B., ii, 3, 31.)

प्रकृतावनुप्रविश्य, तां परिणाम्य, तत्परिणामनियामकतया तत्र स्थित्वा, आत्मनो बहुधाकरणात् ॥ (B.S.B., i, 4, 27.)

All this would inevitably lead to the assumption of the co-existence with God of matter and souls. Like Aristotle and the Grecian philosophers, Madhva looks upon the orderly realm of natural process as having neither a beginning nor an end[2] प्रवाहतोऽनादि ; जगत्प्रवाहः सत्योऽयम् । ...................... .) The Cosmos is no less everlasting than

2. अनागता अतीताश्च यावन्तः सहिताः क्षणाः ।
अतीतानागताश्चैव यावन्तः परमाणवः ।
ततोऽनन्तगुणिता जीवानां राशयः पृथक् ॥
इति वत्सश्रुतेर्न संसारिणां परिसमाप्तिरस्मत्पक्षे ॥ (Madhva, *VTN*)

God on whom it depends. The changeable no less than the Unchangeable is an ultimate component of Reality as a whole :—

स्वतन्त्रं परतन्त्रं च द्विविधं तत्त्वमिष्यते ।
स्वतन्त्रो भगवान्विष्णुः परतन्त्रं द्विधेतरत् ॥ (*Tattvasaṁkhyāna*)

## CHAPTER VIII.

## REVIEW OF CERTAIN GENERAL CRITICISMS ON MADHVA'S CONCEPTION OF GOD

Turn we now to the charge that a Dualism like Madhva's "makes the independence of God impossible."[1] One would have thought that the independence of God was nowhere safer and more appropriately demonstrable than in a *dualism like Madhva's.* The explanation of this seeming paradox lies in the fact already made clear, that Madhva's philosophy is in point of fact, no Dualism at all in the odious and generally accepted sense of that term. Dualism is the recognition of *two independent* principles and we have seen only too clearly that Madhva is *not* a Dualist in this sense.

The confusion is however, apt to be produced by the name of "Dvaita" and its English equivalent of Dualism, commonly given to the system. It may be admitted that the system has not been very happy in the choice of a name for itself. The name "Dvaita" was doubtless originally adopted as being in direct antithesis to the "A-dvaita" and so was allowed to pass muster all the time, despite its ultimate inadequacy. Madhva himself does not appear to have been enamoured of it and his own preference, so far as can be judged from his works, seems to have been for "Tattva-vāda",[2] Theistic Realism or the philosophy of "Truth." The latter is also the name that is largely to be found applied to Madhva's philosophy, in the writings of the Bengal Vaiṣṇavas like Jīva Gosvāmin,[3] Kavikarṇapūra[4] and Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa[5]

1. S. Radhakrishnan, *I. Phil.*, ii, p. 750.
2. इति सर्वज्ञमुनिना मायावादतमोऽखिलम् ।
निरस्तं तत्त्ववादेन सतां संशयनुत्तये ॥ (MK. end)
3. क्वचित्स्वयमदृष्टाकराणि च तत्त्ववादगुरूणां .... .... श्रीमध्वाचार्यचरणानां भागवत-तात्पर्य ... ... (*Ṣaṭ-sandarbha*, p. 21-22.)
4. अपरे तत्त्ववादिनः तेऽपि तथाविधा एव ।
(*Caitanyacandrodaya*, viii, p. 174, Calcutta.)
5. पिबत्यलिः सच्छवितत्त्ववादः । (*Prameyaratnāvalī.*)

and even some of the South Indian followers of Madhva such as Vādirāja[6] and Purandaradāsa.[6a] The name "Dvaita" appears to have originated among the opponents of the system, chiefly the Advaitins and thence found its way gradually into the traditional circles also, of the followers of Madhva. It is remarkable that even in that scurrilous stanza of his at the end of the *Advaitasiddhi,* where Madhusūdana refers to the defender of the Dvaita, he calls him a Tattva-vādi[7]. " Tattva-vāda " would thus contrast with the "Māyāvāda" of Śamkara and the "Dvaita" with his "A-dvaita." At the same time, it would be necessary to remember that Madhva stands *not* for an absolute dualism in philosophy: Aikāntika-Dvaita, of the type of the Sāmkhya-Yogas or Nyāya-Vaiśeṣkas. Inadequate as it is, the appellation "Dvaita" has come to stay and it would be impossible, at this distance of time, to try to replace it by another even if a better one could be found. The utmost that discerning students can do is, while accepting the term Dvaita as it has come down to us, to disabuse the minds of laymen and others of any erroneous notion respecting the highest metaphysical ideology of Madhva that so inadequate a name for his philosophy might have engendered. The supreme fact in Madhva's philosophy is *not* so much the *co*-existence of the Universe with God, but the Transcendent being and Majesty of the latter. This is a fact which he is never tired of emphasising in his works:—

(श्रीमन्मध्वमते हरिः परतरः)
स्वतन्त्रं परतन्त्रं च द्विविधं तत्त्वमिष्यते ।

न ततोऽस्त्यपरं जगतीड्यतमम् .... ।
न हरेः परमो न हरेः सदृशः .... ॥

(*Dvādaśastotra*, iii, 2 and 4).

सर्वे वेदाश्च नामानि ता वा एता ऋचस्तथा ।

(*Ṛg-bhāśya*, p. 3b *et seq.*).

6. *Yuktimallikā,* I, 20.

6a. Cf. The refrain in one of his songs:
श्रीतत्त्ववादमतव भजिसि सुखियागिरैय्य ।

7. इह कुमतिरतत्त्वे तत्त्ववादी वराकः
... ... ।

स्वतः प्रवृत्त्यशक्तत्वादीशावास्यमिदं जगत् ।
तदधीनप्रवृत्तित्वात्तदीयं सर्वमेव तत् । (*Īśa. bh.*).

भगवतः सर्वोत्तमत्वज्ञान एव सर्ववाक्यानां महातात्पर्यमिति ज्ञापयितुम् ।
(*Kaṭha. bh.*, ii, 8, p. 11().

ऋगाद्या अपरा विद्या यदा विष्णोर्न वाचकाः । (*Muṇḍaka bh.*)

अद्वैतं परमार्थतः—उत्तमत्वात्परार्थोऽसौ भगवान्विष्णुरुच्यते ।
अद्वैतं नाम यदुच्यते तत् स्वतन्त्रभगवदपेक्षया । (*Māṇḍ. Up.* i, 17*d.*)
(*Chān. Up.* Com. II, 22, p. 15b).

अतः सर्वमुक्तेभ्योऽप्युत्तमोत्तमः पूर्णो नारायण इति सिद्धम् ।
(*Ṣaṭpraśṇa bh.*)

नेदं जीवस्वरूपं यत् .... .... । (*Talavakāra bh.*)

न केवलं ऋष्यादि नाम.... .... (*Ait. Up. bh.*, ii, 2,2).

तस्मान्मुक्तैरपीज्यमानः .... .... । (*ibid.*, p. 16.)

एक एव महायोगी .... .... । (*Taitt. Up. bh.* p. 9b).

एवं सर्वोत्तमस्य परमेश्वरस्य विज्ञानात्सर्वं विज्ञातं भवति ।
(*Bṛh. Up. bh.*, p. 11b).

महातात्पर्यविरोधश्चाभेदे । विष्णोः परमोत्कर्षे हि महातात्पर्यं सर्वप्रमाणानां भगवताभिहितम् । (Chan. vi, 45)

अतः सर्वचिदचिद्विलक्षणः सर्वोत्तमः सर्वगुणपूर्णश्च भगवान्पुरुषोत्तम इति सिद्धम् ।
(*Chān. bh.*, vi, 6.)

य एतत्परतन्त्रं तु सर्वमेव हरेः सदा ।
वशमित्येव जानाति संसारान्मुच्यते हि सः । (TV)

सर्वज्ञं सर्वकर्तारम् .... .... । (VTN., p. 19b)

विष्णोः सर्वोत्कर्ष एव महातात्पर्यं सर्वागमानाम् । (VTN., p. 20).

अतः सर्वागमैरेव सर्वस्माद्भिन्नः .... । (*Ibid.*)

"एकलं केवलं चेति स्वतन्त्रमभिधीयते ।

..................................

स्वातन्त्र्यमेव सत्यत्वं विष्णोः ; अन्यस्य सत्यता ।
प्रवाहतः सदास्तित्वं पुम्प्रकृत्योः सदास्तिता ॥
तत् स्वातन्त्र्येण नैवास्ति यदुत्पत्तिविनाशवत् ।
जगतो नास्तिता सैव या पराधीनता सदा ।
अभावस्तु कुतस्तस्य यद्भिभातीह सर्वदा ।
अविद्यमानता नाम जगतः परतन्त्रता ।
यथाशक्तस्तु पुत्रादिरसन्नित्युच्यते जनैः ॥"

(*Bhāgavata-Tātparya,* XI, 28, 20-7).

[The independent is known as the One: "Ekalam," "Kevalam" etc. *The reality of God consists in His independence.* The reality of others is merely an eternal existence *a la the currents a river.* It is so in the case of the Souls and Prakṛti. That which has a beginning and an end has no *independent existence.* The non-existence of the world is no other than its eternal dependence. But it is not for that reason wholly a myth as it is experienced by one and all. So the only way in which it could be described as not existing, is in the sense of its being under the control of another, even as a son who is dependent on his father is treated as of little account.]

पारमार्थिकसत्यत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यमभिधीयते ।
तद्विष्णोरेव नान्यस्य ; तदन्येषां सदास्तिता ॥

(*Bhāg. Tāt.* XI, 24, 17).

[The highest kind of Reality is independence. That is possessed by Viṣṇu *alone.* All others merely *exist* for ever.]

And *Mahābhārata-Tātparyanirṇaya,* i, 68-*et seq.*

In view of so much arrestive evidence of the 'monistic' bearings *of a sort,* of Madhva's Philosophy, at its highest level, I have, as already indicated (P. 14), ventured to coin the name of "स्वतन्त्राद्वैत" "Svatan-

trādvaita" or THE PHILOSOPHY OF "The ONE INDEPENDENT TRANSCENDENT REFERENCE" for the system and this, I am glad to say, has the approval of the greatest living authority on the system: H. H. Śrī Satyadhyāna Tīrtha Svamiji of the Uttarādi Mutt.

A correct appreciation then, of this fundamental aspect of Madhva's teaching would remove the popular misconception of the essence of his thought, that one so often finds not merely in laymen but in the writings of scholars who ought to know better.

We have seen that Madhva stoutly denies any kind of independence or even so much as the barest capacity to exist *in their own right*, to Matter and Souls.[8] There is no power on earth that is capable of challenging the independence of God. How then, could it be in jeopardy?[9] God's independence again could be challenged only in the event of there existing another equally independent Being or Principle. We know full well that there is no room for any such principle in Madhva's philosophy. Where then is the danger to the independence of God to come from? Again, the very idea of the independence of God presupposes an existence of creatures dependent upon Him. The *only Being that exists* (द्वितीयवस्तुरहित) can *neither be said to be independent* nor dependent! The monist cannot therefore pretend to be over-solicitous about the independence of God! However that may be, the independence of God is unquestionably possible in the system of Madhva in which the other reals are *for ever subject to God.*

Madhva agrees also that the dependent reals cannot be called substances in the highest sense of the term; and to that extent there is no limitation of God's independence by that of any other substance: पारमार्थिकसत्यत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यमभिधीयते। तद्विष्णोरेव नान्यस्य। It cannot be that the very idea of an "other", dependent or other, besides God, constitutes a metaphysical limitation on God and to that extent renders His independence impossible. Madhva would answer that the merest existence of an "other" that is *ex hypothesi* dependent on

8. प्रकृत्यादिसत्ताप्रदत्वं चाङ्गीकृतमीश्वरस्य। (Madhva, B.S.B., ii, 2, 5.)
It is therefore a gross mis-statement of facts to say that Madhva believes that unevolved matter and unmaterial souls on which the Divine will is dependent at creation, are "given from outside." (S. Radhakrishnan, *I. Phil.*, ii, p. 699).

9. साधनानां साधनत्वं यदात्माधीनमिष्यते।
तदा साधनसम्पत्तिरैश्वर्यद्योतिका भवेत्॥ (B.S.B. II, i, 19).

God, cannot at all constitute a limitation on the latter.[10] It is only when that "other" is raised to a position of equality or set in opposition to the Brahman, that real limitation can arise. Were it not so, even the presence of the "Anirvacanīya" world should have to be considered as an inevitable limitation of the Absolute. The question of its absolute reality can have nothing to do with that of limitation. If an " unreal other " or a " phenomenally real " world could not limit the Absolute, so may the subordinate real (in Madhva's system) be unable to do! For purposes of such limitation, the subordinate real is as good as being " unreal " :—

जगतो नास्तिता सैव या पराधीनता सदा ।

(Madhva, *Bhāgavata-Tātparya,* xi, 28, 22).

As Madhva points out in his com. on Chān. Up. vi 2, even to repudiate it, the Monist has at least in thought to conceive of a difference between the Brahman and the unreal " other " (Vijātīyabheda). This *difference* at least must be real and true and to that extent there could be no escape from a limitation to the Absolute.

विजातीयाभावे—" येनाश्रुतं " इत्यादिविशेषणं व्यर्थम् । यस्य कस्यचिज्ज्ञानमपि तज्ज्ञानमेव भवतीति । न च मिथ्या सत्यमिति भेदः ; तस्यैव विजातीयत्वात् । तद्भेदस्य मिथ्यात्वे तद्भेदस्य सत्यत्वप्रसङ्गः । मिथ्यासत्ययोरैक्ये इदं सत्यमिदं मिथ्येति भेदाभावाज्जीवेशयोर्भेदादेरपि सत्यत्वप्रसङ्गः । (*Chān. Up. bhāsya,* vi, 2, p. 39).

Though Madhva "conceives the Infinite in an abstract manner,"[11] it cannot be said that he is therefore "unable to see any unity between the two". On the contrary, he believes that at least in point of possessing "reality", there is a common factor[12] and a basis for unity between God

10. नहीच्छया प्रकृत्यादिकं उपाददानस्य परायत्तता । नहि पटुकरणो लीलानिमित्तमिच्छया दण्डमवलम्ब्य गच्छन् दण्डायत्तगतिः भवति ! (NS. p. 184-5).

11. Yet his conception of God is not that of a merely last term in an ascending series of real reflecting self-conscious souls, nor that of a merely Transcendent Absolute. While the conscious and the unconscious objects of the Universe co-exist with God, they yet derive their existence from Him and are sustained by Him. He is their life and soul both immanent and transcendent.

12. Cf. Śamkara : ब्रह्मणोऽपि तर्हि सत्तालक्षणः स्वभावः आकाशादिष्वनुवर्तमानो दृश्यते ॥ (B.S. ii, 1, 6.)

And यादृशं ब्रह्मणः सत्त्व तादृशं स्याज्जगत्यपि । (*Nyāyāmṛta,* i, 9. p. 95*b*).

and the world: यथा खलु सकलजगत्सदृशगुणात्मकत्वेन परमात्मा जगदिति व्यपदिश्यते 'सर्वं खल्विद ब्रह्म 'इत्यादौ, तथैवेति भावः (TP. II.3.29). This affinity is still more marked between God and the souls: ज्ञानानन्दादिब्रह्मगुणा एवास्य यतः सारः स्वरूपं अतोऽभेदव्यपदेशः ॥ (Madhva, BS. ii. 3, 29). The only difference is that this unity or affinity between the Brahman and the world is neither physical (as in Rāmānuja's view), nor imaginary as an Śaṁkara's.

"If the Brahman is co-eternal with the world, what is the relation between the two? If it is also a coeternal relation, is the Supreme Spirit bound to objects other than itself?", asks the critic of Madhva. The answer is that the Brahman is co-eternal with the Prakṛti (not with the world as such) and the souls and the relation among them is also co-eternal. But it does not necessarily follow that the Supreme Being is *bound* to objects other than itself.[13] We have already seen in connection with the criticism of Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaita, that Madhva is quite averse to tying down the Deity in any manner. Indeed, it is to avoid the necessity of having to tie down the Deity, that he "conceives the Brahman in an abstract manner"! There can be no question of the Supreme being *bound* to others, when it is repeated time and again that the world of matter and souls derives its very power of existence and functioning from God, that its very co-existence with Him is dependent on His will and sufferance: "द्रव्यं कर्म च कालश्च......यदनुग्रहतः सन्ति" Madhva is never tired of reminding us that Time, Space, Causality, Matter, Souls their Karma etc. are all eternally subject to God and exist at His pleasure. Why these should at all so exist, is an illegitimate question. All that we know, can know or need know (of course through the Scriptures) is that they exist in eternal dependence on God. In so far then as their existence is determined by God's will स्वमतिप्रभवं जगदस्य यतः (*Dvādaśastotra* iv.2), their existence and the relation in which they stand (नियम्यनियामकभाव) to Him, cannot be viewed as anything more than a self-limitation[14] on the part of God. The same could be said of the other difficul-

13. *Cf.* "The controlled, the pervaded, is bound to the controller and pervader; but not *vice versa*. The former is dependent on the latter, but the latter is independent. The wind bloweth where it listeth but the weather-cock answereth to every movement of the wind. What is the logical absurdity in saying that the weather-cock is bound to the wind but not the wind to the weather-cock?" C. R. Krishna Rau, *Śrī Madhva, His Life and Doctrine,* Udipi, 1929, pp. 153-4.

14. Self-limitation is frequently the refuge of the monist: Cf. "Unlike the Pradhāna of the Sāmkhya, it (Māyā) is not independent of God. It is a limitation

ties such as that " we cannot say that it is in the nature of the Supreme to stand related to the individual souls since the former does not contain the reason for the latter's existence, and that it is difficult to believe that God's essence involves a relation to objects whose existence it does not necessitate" (S. Radhakrishnan, I. Phil. ii 750). Madhva admits the truth of these contentions but rejoins that the difficulties are more than counter-balanced by the hypothesis of self-limitation.

The entire question of a possible limitation to the sovereignty of God in the event of recognising the eternal existence of Prakṛti and Puruṣas (though in perpetual dependence on God), has been set at rest by Madhva himself, in his illuminating commentary on the तदनन्यत्वाधिकरण of the Sūtras ii, 1, 15-21. He contends under ii, 1, 15, that the Independent creator of the Universe is none other than the Brahman, *i.e.*, to say the Brahman is itself the Independent Cause of the world—as in R.V. X, 81, 2a. the presence of *independent accessories* to creation, such as Time, Matter and Souls, is denied. The evidence of Scripture merely supports the dependent character of these accessories: काल आसीत् पुरुष आसीत् तदधीनमासीत् (q. in ii, 1, 12) तस्माद्धान्यन्नपरः किंचनास । An apparently different statement in नासदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीम् । R.V.X., 129, 1. denying the very existence of anything other than the Brahman, should not be understood in the sense of a total negation (स्वरूपनिषेध) of these things. They are spoken of as Asat, not existing, in so far as they were then unmanifest, dependent, inferior, subject to modification and subsequent decay (TP. ii, 1, 18). That they nevertheless existed, is borne out by a subsequent text तम आसीत् as well as by the expression तदानीम् , which proves the existence of Time. It may no doubt be felt that it would be better for God to do without the accessories at all than to make Him rely upon such as are in turn dependent upon Him for their existence. But it is pointed out that it adds to sovereignty of God to conceive of Him as acting with the help of accessories which are themselves dependent on Him. There is not so much sovereignty implied in making Him do straightway without any accessories. For, in the other case, the Sādhanas themselves would owe their being to Him and that would certainly add to His glory:—

which Īśvara imposes on Himself. It exists even in Pralaya, depending on the Supreme Lord". S. Radhakrishnan, *I. Phil.*, ii, p. 573.

साधनानां साधनत्वं यदात्माधीनमिष्यते ।
तदा साधनसम्पत्तिरैश्वर्यद्योतिका भवेत् ॥ (B.S.B. ii, 1, 19)

न महिमाधिक्यलाभाय साधनाभावोऽङ्गीकर्तव्यः । साधनान्तरेण सृष्टेरपि युक्तत्वात् ; महिमाविरोधित्वात् । स्वाधीनसाधनैः प्रवृत्तेरपि ऐश्वर्यद्योतकत्वस्य—" साधनानां साधनत्वम् .... ...." इत्यादिवाक्यसिद्धत्वात् ; लोके दृष्टत्वाच्च ॥ तर्हि, उभयथापि महिमोत्कर्षसिद्धेः, किं साधनसत्त्वपक्षाग्रहेणेति चेत् ; निरपेक्षतया स्रष्टृत्वस्योभयपक्षसाम्येन महिमोत्कर्षलाभसाम्येऽपि, साधनसत्वाभ्युपगमेन एकाकिनः सकशात्सोपस्करस्याधिक्योत्कर्षलाभात् ॥

(*Tattvaprakāśika* ii, 1, 19).

Though it may theoretically be conceded that God *can,* if He *so* chooses, create *without the help of accessories,*[15] still, the facts recorded in Scripture, go to show that He does not despise the presence of accessories, but avails of them in so far as they owe their existence to Him, and proceeds with Creation, thus conferring a sort of distinction and recognition upon them. Our 'partiality' for the recognition of accessories, is *not thus* merely a sentimental one.[16] It is inspired by a desire to abide by the facts vouchsafed to us by Scripures, which are the ultimate source of our knowledge regarding these matters cf.:—

आम्नायस्यार्थं प्रतिपत्तुं प्रभवामः नाम्नायं पर्यनुयोक्तुम् ॥[17]
(Śaṁkara, B. S. B. i, 4, 3).

94975

15. Cf. शक्तोऽपि भगवान्विष्णुरकर्तुं कर्तुमन्यथा ।
स्वभिन्नं कारणाभिन्नं भिन्नं विश्वं करोत्यजः ॥
(Av. ii, 1, p. 17)

and the brilliant exposition thereon by Jayatīrtha, quoted *ante.*

16. It is thus quite unfair to assume, at least so far as Madhva is concerned that " in the discussions of the intermediate degrees of reality, the unit of individuality seems to depend on the *fancy* of the philosophers." (S. Radhakrishnan, *I. Phil.,* i, p. 41.) [Italics mine].

17. We can only *follow* the sense of the scriptures but *not question* it!

JL
T4m211A, N32

# CHAPTER IX.

## GENERAL REFLECTIONS AND RETROSPECT.*

From the foregoing exposition of certain of the philosophical bases of Madhva's Theism, it would be easy to arrive at a general estimate of its religious and philosophical value. The Ācārya appeared on the scene of Indian Philosophy as a champion of Theism and a re-interpreter of the *entire Vedaśāstra,* whose basic ideas appeared to him to have been distorted by the philosophy of Śaṁkara. Madhva's high sense of orthodoxy was responsible for his endeavouring to give a panoptic interpretation of the *entire sacred literature of his country* and correlating the various parts and strata of it to the highest metaphysics thereof. This is symbolised by his commentaries on parts of the *Ṛg-Veda,* the *Ait. Brāhmana,* the *Ait. Āryaṇyaka* and the *Upaniṣads,* the *Gītā,* the *Mahābhārata,* the *Bhāgavata,* and the *Sūtras,* and frequent quotations from the *Purāṇas* and the *Pañcarātras.*

On the religious side, his interpretations had the effect of changing the entire aspect and significance of the distinction between the Karma and the Jñāna-kāṇḍas.

ऋगाद्या अपरा विद्या यदा विष्णोर्न वाचकाः ।
ता एव परमा विद्या यदा विष्णोस्तु वाचकाः ॥

(*Muṇḍaka* Com.) .

It was no doubt of great spiritual advantage to be told that the entire Vedic literature including the so-called Karmakāṇḍa could help in furthering spiritual knowledge if only we know how to tap them properly and at the correct point. But to carry this doctrine to extreme lengths would be artificial and unhistorical. Yet that was virtually the nemesis that overtook Madhva. His insistence on a literal correlation of every line and syllable of the Karma-kāṇḍa too,[1] to the Brahman, though admir-

*This critique of Madhva's philosophy and interpretation of the Vedānta, which has been inserted for reasons that need not be detailed here, has been undertaken from the point of view of the detatched observer. It is not meant for the followers of the Ācārya and may, if so desired, be ignored by them.

1. Cf. सकलजगत्कारणे परे ब्रह्मणि स्वरवर्णपदवाक्यमहावाक्यरूपस्य समस्तशास्त्रस्य साक्षात् परममुख्यया वृत्त्या, नतु लक्षणया ; तथा महातात्पर्येण, नतु पारार्थ्येन; समन्वयः प्रथमाध्याये समर्थितः॥ (NS. ii, 1, p. 229)

able as a stroke of Textual mysticism, fails to carry conviction as a purely exegetic method,—the actual working out of such Samanvaya being, in most cases, little more than a pyrotechny of words.[2] It would have been simpler and less sophisticated if he had been content with a general correlation of texts (Paramparayā samanvaya) such as may be safely recognised through such texts as: यज्ञार्थात्कर्मणोऽन्यत्र (Gitā iii, 9) and कर्म मोक्षाय कर्माणि विधत्ते ह्यगदं यथा (Bhāg. xi, 3, 45). We have already drawn attention to the amount of 'false etymology' and unscientific exegesis that a dogged adherence to the principle of "Sarvaśabdasamanvaya" in Brahman, entails upon Madhva. Much of his unpopularity as interpreter of the sacred literature is due thus to his etymological stunts. But the rule of texts is inexorable: मां । विधत्तेऽभिधत्ते माम् (*Bhāg* xi 21, 43) सर्वे वेदाः यत्पदमामनन्ति (*Katha*, i, 2, 15) वेदैश्च सर्वैरहमेव वेद्यः। (*Gitā*, xv. 15)

ii

It would have been noticed in Part II, that Madhva's theory of God in its religious aspect is deeply colored by theological considerations which are generally alien to the philosopher but which are inevitable in one who seeks to combine religion and philosophy or undertakes to educe a philosophy from the entire religious literature of his country. It is in the nature of things impossible for one in the position of Madhva to abjure the national gods and talk glibly of a Brahman. Room has necessarily to be found for them in any scheme of Philosophy. The question of who amongst them is to be regarded as the Supreme Being of metaphysics, comes to be invested with special significance and immediate interest. It does not arise for a Monist like Śaṁkara, to whom the gods of the land are in the last resort but appearances of The One and the question of the real identity of the Supreme has no meaning. But a Theist like Madhva who believes in a Personal God, possessing a unique personality of His own, cannot dismiss the question of the precise identity of the Supreme as of little practical or theoretical importance. Indeed, everything in his case, depends on the fixation of the identity of the True God. It has been said that "Monotheism is the acknowledgment and worship of One True God. It implies a denial of other gods, at any rate of their jurisdiction over the Cosmos." As a Hindu, however, Madhva cannot go to this extreme of denying the existence of other 'minor gods.' And he concedes to them *imperium in imperio*. They are

2. Vide his interpretation of "Jyotiradhikaraṇa":—

जातमोतं हरौ यस्माज्ज्योतिषः प्राणरूपतः ।

reduced to the position of angels subject to the Lord and their jurisdiction over the cosmos is derived from the Supreme Being :

Cf. तत्र तत्र स्थितो विष्णुः तत्तच्छक्तिप्रबोधकः । (Av. i, p. 9b).

and :— तत्र तत्र स्थितो विष्णुः तत्तच्छक्तीः प्रबोधयन् ।
एक एव महाशक्तिः कुरुते सर्वमञ्जसा ॥ (B. S. B. ii, 3, 11).

निमित्तमात्रमीशस्य विश्वसर्गनिरोधयोः ।
हिरण्यगर्भः शर्वश्च कालाख्यारूपिणस्तव ॥ (Bhāg, X, 71, 8.)

ब्रह्मणि ब्रह्मरूपोऽसौ शिवरूपी शिवे स्थितः ॥
स ब्रह्मणा सृजति रुद्रेण विलापयति । (B. S. B. ii, 1, 13).

Madhva has sufficient appreciation of the essence of Monotheism to deny that the minor gods are "gods" in any real sense of the term. He puts them down for "Jīvas"; only, there is a hierarchy among them starting from Brahmā down to the lowest[3a] ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तम् । He overcomes the historical ideas of the plurality of Vedic gods by the doctrine of एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति or the doctrine of the Sarvanāmavān. There can be no objection to this though exception may be taken to his identification of the Sarvanāmavān with Viṣṇu. Clever and in many cases really unexceptionable as have been the texts adduced by Madhva to support the equation, he cannot be said to have completely succeeded in proving his case. There are stray texts like जनितोत विष्णोः (R.V. ix, 96, 5) which nearly defy his resources and ingenuity. He himself is not unaware of the existence of such passages. In spite of such occasional difficulties that he has had to face, it must be said that he is generally in a position to afford a smooth sailing. The evidences adduced by him are arresting so far as they go. In one instance it is telling: एकं सद्विप्रा (R.V. i, 164, 46) which is in apposition with सप्तार्धगर्भा विष्णोस्तिष्ठन्ति

3a. Cf. the similar attitude taken up by Rāmānuja :—

आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्ता जगदन्तर्व्यवस्थिताः ।
प्राणिनः कर्मजनितसंसारवशवर्तिनः ।
यतस्ततो न ते ध्याने परेषामुपकारकाः ॥ (*Śrībhaṣya* 1.1.1.)
and :— हिरण्यगर्भादिजीवेभ्योऽन्य एव परमात्मा । (*ibid*, i, 1, 22)

प्रदिशा विधर्मणि । (R.V. i, 164, 36). In others it is highly suggestive अन्तः समुद्रे । (*T.A.* iii. 1,1) अम्भस्य पारे.........मम योनिरप्स्वन्तः समुद्रे (R.V. x, 125, 7.); though not yet unequivocal till we reach the *Bhāllaveya Śruti.* It is also significant that in the Vedic literature subsequent to the Mantras, Viṣṇu recedes to the background. The attempts made by Madhva to read Viṣṇu into such texts as: णकारो बलं षकारः प्राण आत्मा (*Ait. Ā* iii.2,6) and find a place for him in the highest philosophy of the Upaniṣads, adroit as they have been (Cf. सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत (Chān. Up. com. 3, 14, 1), cannot be said to be convincing. The same is the case in the *Vedānta Sūtras,* where too, textually speaking, Viṣṇu is nowhere seriously thought of; though here again, Madhva is able to find a couple of sūtras from the *Devatākāṇḍa,* which equate the Brahman with Viṣṇu. As these sūtras have been cited by Vedānta Deśika also, *the matter deserves closer attention.* As for the Epic, it is decidedly in Madhva's favour. (See Winternitz, *Ind. Literature,* i, p. 320, para 2). His solution of the conflicting views of the Purāṇas on the relative superiority of the gods, in favour of Viṣṇu, on the basis of (1) the three-fold division of the Purāṇas and (2) the theory of "deception", loses none of its probative value, whatever one may think of the ethical acceptability of such notions. It may be conceded then, that *given* the Hindu scriptures *in their present form* and *admitting the rationale of finding the Supreme from that Pantheon* सहैव सन्तं न विजानन्ति देवाः (*T. Ā.* iii, 11, 5) the balance of evidence does unmistakably incline to the comparative supremacy of Viṣṇu. If this were sufficient ground for his identification with the Brahman of the Vedānta, Madhva may be said to have won his point. Inevitable as has been the theological bias about Madhva's religious philosophy, it is really not so vital to his metaphysical ideology of the Brahman. It is possible to keep these two things apart and shorn of the trappings of theological preferences and exclusions, Madhva's idea of God as *id quo maius cogitari non potest* and presented in the concepts of the Svatantra defined as स्वरूपप्रमितिप्रवृत्तिलक्षणसत्तात्रैविध्ये परानपेक्षम् । and Svatantrādvaita, deserve high philosophic recognition. This would by itself vindicate his claims to a philosophical outlook. It would also conduce to the greater philosophical popularity of Madhva's philosophy if the theological side is altogether dropped out and the philosophical one alone presented or maintained.

### iii.

We cannot say that Śaṁkara's is the only possible or even that metaphysically it is the best solution of the conflict of the Bheda and

Abheda śrutis,—in other words of the problem of Philosophy. There is *less* violence done to the Bhedaśrutis in the system of Madhva, which subordinates all else that exists to the Brahman which is conceived as the One Transcendent Reference, *than* in that of Śaṁkara who denies reality to the world that he may preserve the oneness of Brahman and dismisses the Bhedaśrutis as referring to an illusory Bheda. The Viśiṣṭādvaitic view is too concrete to admit of an easy approximation to the Substantive Idealism of the Upaniṣads. The synthesis effected by Madhva from the standpoint of "Svatantrādvaita" or the One Transcendent Reference, is thus a clear improvement upon the colourless monism निर्विशेषाद्वैत of Śaṁkara on the one hand and quaint dualism of Rāmānuja on the other. The oneness visualised by Madhva is that which springs from the world's recognition of its utter metaphysical dependence on God: तत्तन्त्रत्वादैतदात्म्यम् (Chān. Bhāṣya vi.6). The Viśiṣṭādvaitin misses the abstract character of God while the Advaitin altogether ignores the relative aspect (and existence) of the world of matter and souls at all times under the aegis of God. The "Svatantrādvaita" of Madhva has the advantge of preserving the two in proper blend. Under the terms of:

द्रव्यं कर्म च कालश्च स्वभावो जीव एव च ।
यदनुग्रहतः सन्ति न सन्ति यदुपेक्षया ॥

(Bhāg. ii, 10, 12.)

which is really the corner-stone of Madhva's "Svatantrādvaita", the Absolute is implied in the very life and being of the relative (Paratantra).

iv.

Madhva agrees with the Advaitin in conceiving of bondage as due to a beginningless ignorance (bhāvarūpājñāna). But he shows a fundamentally realistic bias in looking upon this ignorance itself as having a real existence of its own and not due merely to a superimposition (kalpita). It is no doubt difficult to conceive of a *beginningless ignorance* that does *not* penetrate the essence of the soul. But such qualification is necessary if release should at all be made possible.[3] A beginningless ignorance that is common to most systems of Indian philosophy (including the Advaita) cannot be deemed to be a flaw in one case alone. To posit a beginning for ignorance is equally unphiloso-

3. स्वरूपस्यानपायात् ।

phical as that would at once give rise to the question of the *why* of the *first fall of man,* which no one could satisfactorily answer. There is, however, not much to choose between *an unreal ignorance* that is beginningless and a *real ignorance* that is also *equally* beginningless. Both are in need of explanation. And after all, an unreal ignorance that continues to exist from eternity, is hardly distinguishable from a reality. Opinion may differ if dependence or unreality (of the "other") is the most effective solvent of the conflict and limitation in regard to the Absolute. To dismiss the world as unreal may no doubt serve to preserve the oneness of the Brahman intact; but then, it is not the only way in which such a result could be achieved. Insist on the absolute dependence of all else on God and you have the transcendent oneness of God brought home all the clearer. The latter course is adopted by Madhva as the more reasonable one. For, even the monist has ultimately to fall back upon a Māyā that is not precisely identical with the Brahman but is however dependent on it: परमात्मन्योतप्रोतभावेन समाश्रितम् (Śaṁkara on *Kaṭha,* i, 3, 11 and B.S. 1, 4, 8). Surely, it would be far more absurd and difficult for God to *delude Himself* than to keep those in *His power* under a delusion! A despotic God may still hope to be One but a foolish one could not! From the point of view of us suffering mortals, it would in any case be the worst despotism to plead that creation is the sport or nature of God. Of the two views however, Madhva's makes the position of God less unenviable. Under Kaṭha i, 3, 11, Śaṁkara admits the existence Avyakta as an "other". No doubt the śruti traces all creation to Brahman; but really Avyakta is the cause of all. Since however it is dependent on God, He is styled as Cause only figuratively,—not in the sense of a changing principle like Avyakta: सर्वस्य प्रपञ्चस्य कारणमव्यक्तम्। तस्य परमात्मपरतन्त्रत्वात् परमात्मन उपचारेण कारणत्वमुच्यते; न तु अव्यक्तवत् विकारितया॥ (Ānandagiri). The Advaitin makes a desperate attempt to escape अद्वैतहानि (danger to the principle of monism) by asserting that Avyakta is only a "power" of Brahman: शक्तित्वेन अद्वितीयत्वाविरोधमाह (Ānandagiri). Despite all the ingenious beating about the bush[3a] the two have necessarily to be distinguished in so far as "Avyakta" is a 'changing cause' while Brahman is not; and the latter is Sat while the former is "Anirvacanīya".

3a. It would for instance be ludicrous to hold that the शक्ति is an unreal principle (मिथ्या) while the शक्तिमत् is real. The one should be as real as the other (सवितृप्रकाशवत्)

It would be philosophically less disingenous then to admit the "otherness" of Avyakta and its reality and maintain the sovereignty of God on the basis of the admitted "dependence" of the former than to have to return to the self-same Avyakta and an admission of its essence, through a backdoor. Madhva adopts the former course and in so doing feels that so long as there is this necessity for philosophers to look to an "other" to account for the world, nothing would be lost in recognising that "Other" to be a *real* principle, dependent *ex hypothesi* on God. So long as philosophers have willy nilly to fall back upon a metaphysical "other" (be it the Prakṛti or Māyā or Matter), they need not grudge it its reality!

V.

Madhva conceives God not merely as the Artificer of the Universe (the 'ब्रह्माण्डकुलाल' of the Naiyāyikas) but *as the very Source of its being* सत्यस्य सत्यम्; प्रकृत्यादि सत्ताप्रदत्वमङ्गीकृतमीश्वरस्य (B. S. B. ii, 2, 5)[4] This is sufficient to establish his claims to be recognised as a Vedāntin. Save for a difference in terminology, this view makes the nearest (Hindu) approach to the Christian viewpoint. Of the two however, Madhva's is certainly the more philosophical. An eternal creation is no creation at all, whilst creation in time is fraught with difficulties. The only sense therefore, in which the world can be said to be a creation of God, is (that of) an eternal dependence of one beginningless real upon another and a more powerful One. Madhva makes a concession in thought to Christian Theism in granting *at least hypothetically* that God *can* create a world from nothing. But for some reason known only to Himself, He chooses to educe a world from pre-existent Matter and souls. If he can admit eternal and uncreated souls, the Vedāntin need not shy at the acceptance of an equally uncreated matter! No Indian philosopher however adroit has been able or temerarious enough to *derive* Matter from God. It exists on the Advaitic view also *as a force latent in God*: परमात्मन्योतप्रोतभावेन समाश्रितं वटकाणिकायामिव वटवृक्षशक्तिः (Śamkara, on Kaṭha, i, 3, 11). Madhva therefore adopts the only sensible and straightforward course in which the sovereignty and ultimate causality of God can be made consistent with the existence of *such* Matter and souls, by making them *ex hypothesi* dependent on God, for their *being and becoming.* This is substantially the view of Rāmānuja also.[5]

4. See Chap. I of this Part for full elucidation.

5. Cf. सहकारिभिरारम्भे न स्वातन्त्र्यं विहन्यते ।
तत्सद्भावप्रवृत्त्योश्च स्वाधीनत्वव्यवस्थितेः ॥ (Vedānta Deśika, *Tattvamuktākalāpa*, Benares, 1900, p. 255).

vi.

Madhva has done much to clarify the issue of creation. He opposes the enunciation of vague and airy notions. (Cf. his criticism of Śakti-pariṇāmavāda). His contention that a Sentient Cause could not produce solely out of its own self, an insentient effect is virtually the same as the objection of the Vedāntin against the Pariṇāmavādin that the Immutable Spirit could not change into the form of the world. Śaṁkara is thus as much opposed to Pariṇāmavāda, as Madhva. But that does not give him the right to deny the reality of the world. We must only look for the world's material cause elsewhere than in the Brahman. When it comes to that, there is really no special advantage in looking for that material cause in Māyā whose association with the Brahman itself would be difficult to account for. The recognition of Brahman as the Kevala-nimitta and of Matter as the Upādāna-kāraṇa need not be apprehended to involve a plurality of causes, as God is the only Independent Cause and Ultimate Ground of everything—the other causes being 'causes' only in a limited sense: कारणत्वेन चाकाशादिषु यथाव्यपदिष्टोक्तेः। (B. S. B. i, 4, 15).

vii.

True, like every other Vedāntin, Madhva too counsels that we must rise above the world and try to rid ourselves of it. It may therefore be felt that he need not have been so vehement in opposing the Advaitin's advice to his fellowmen to transcend it. But dependent as it is to Madhva, the world is not any the less real as a *fact*. The quarrel between Madhva and the Advaitins is thus something more than one over words. Madhva insists that there is no mistake in our cognition of the world as such. This would not and could not be conceded by the Advaitin who looks upon the "Prapañca-pratyaya" as essentially an "Āropa" or "Adhyāsa" upon the pure consciousness of Ātman.

Cf. स्वाज्ञानकल्पितजगत्परमेश्वरत्वजीवत्वभेदकलुषीकृतभूमभावा ।
(*Samkṣepaśārīraka*, i, 2).

viii.

On the intriguing issue of the precise relation between God and His attributes, Madhva's solution is not only ingenious but highly suggestive. Through religion one becomes increasingly aware of the perfections of God. As a modern writer puts it: "There is no mystery whatsoever about the notion of 'pure being'. *Being* is simply the fundamental category of thought which denotes everything and

cannot therefore specially denote anything,—or in other words, connotes nothing. That which every entity is, cannot be a property by which one entity is, distinguished from others. God, whatever else He is (or is not ?), must certainly *be* ; but so *must* a triangle, a pebble in the street, a planet or the sun. In short, there can be no being which is *simply and purely being*. It is what God is over and above mere being that is of primary significance to the religious consciousness. And as a matter of fact, while insisting that the nature of the Deity can never be appreciated by or expressed in terms familiar to a finite mind, the mystics invariably do ascribe qualities such as oneness, wisdom, goodness and love to Him whom they worship, qualified with which the finite mind is quite familiar and which are not inscrutable." (G. Dawes Hicks, "The Philosophical Bases of Theism," Hibbert Lectures, 1937, p. 117.). It is thus incumbent upon us to recognise that many are the attributes of God: कर्तृत्वात्सगुणं ब्रह्म Bhāg. iii, 32, 13 and मय्यनन्तगुणेऽनन्ते गुणतोऽनन्तविग्रहे। (Bhāg. vi, 4, 48). But to say that God and his attributes are different entities, is unsound. Madhva hits the truth when he says the attributes are actually indistinguishable from the Lord though in all our attempts to refer to them we appear to attempt the impossible. To say as we often do, that God is great or good, is to employ a fiction of thought. Viśeṣa is the name that Madhva gives to this fiction of thought, which is defined as भेदप्रतिनिधि (doing the work of Bheda) without being "Bheda" itself न तु स्वयं भेदः। This keeps intact the unity of the divine nature. In this and in certain other cases, Madhva would appear to have been influenced by a monistic outlook एकधैवानुद्रष्टव्यं नेह नानास्ति किंचन though a staunch Dvaitin himself. This shows his essentially metaphysical attitude of mind that is richly susceptible to the best in the thoughts of even one's rivals.

Rightly understood, the doctrine of Viśeṣas would be seen to be a new and distinctive contribution of Madhva to philosophic thought not only as regards the question of God's personality but of the relation between Substance and Attributes in general and of the treatment of the category of Difference. (See the discussion on the concept of Bheda as Dharmisvarūpa, in the *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya,* Part II, sec. ii, chapter iv; No. 9.)

### ix.

On the question of Freedom vs. Pre-Determination, also Madhva has endeavoured to clear the issues. The soul's agency is real but not independent of God. Individual freedom if it is to be effective, must

be rooted in an unalterable "Savarūpa-Yogyatā" which not even God sees any reason to change or interfere with.

This makes it perfectly clear that Madhva is most anxious to preserve the character of God as a moral Governor. Indeed, so great in his anxiety that he does not even mind Vaiṣamya and Nairghṛṇya, for his God, *at and after a certain point*: See his arresting comment on the sūtra: उपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ॥ (ii, 1, 37): न च पुनर्वैषम्याद्यापातेन दोषः। तादृशवैषम्यादेरुपलभ्यमानत्वात् ॥ and also the remarks:

वैषम्यं निर्घृणत्वं च वेदाप्रामाण्यकारकम् ।
नाङ्गीकार्यमतोऽन्यत्तु न वैषम्यादिनामकम् ॥

(Av., ii, 1.).

quoted and elaborately explained *ante* (Part III, chap. iii, p. 30—31). It would be seen from the earlier exposition, that Madhva would quietly admit *such* Vaiṣamya and Nairghṛṇya (as do not engender a subversion of the moral order) to safeguard the moral personality of God and the smooth operation of the moral law. There is much truth in his contention that beyond a certain point (indicated by him), Vaiṣamya and Nairghṛṇya cease to be moral flaws. Nay, properly viewed, they turn out to be assets. (See page 30-31 *ante* of this part).

The ultimate dependence (metaphysical) of even this Svarūpa on God, is proved by the impossibility of the removal of the last veils of ignorance (Svaguṇācchādikā and Paramācchādikā) without His grace and co-operation. Though essentially a moral governor of the world, God, in Madhva's system is all that religion and philosophy could ask for. The purely philosophical conception of the Deity receives due recognition in the conception of the Brahman as the *One Independent Transcendent Reference*: *Svatantra* defined as स्वरूपप्रमितिप्रवृत्तिलक्षणसत्ता त्रैविध्ये परानपेक्षम् (TS. ṭikā). No philosophy can ask for more.

**X.**

Fundamentally speaking, Madhva's conception of Mokṣa is impeccable. It guarantees the survival of the human personality there and provides such scope as may reasonably be expected in any Theistic system (which must any day be greater than in a monistic mokṣa), for spontaneous activity of the highest kind. Quaint as it may seem, the theory of आनन्दतारतम्य in Mokṣa, is but a corollary of the uniqueness of each soul as a centre of experience. Of course, Madhva need not have transported the distinction of species too, to the world of Mokṣa and

given us a 'zoological garden' there. One wishes also that there might have been a more liberal portrayal of the picture, doing away with the distinction of sex. But the rule of texts has almost been tyrannical to absurdity in his case. Attention has however been drawn to the finer sides of Madhva's theory of Mokṣa (Chap. ii). The recognition of spontaneous activity and desires and the provision for service, etc., in mokṣa, cannot be lightly dismissed as a transference of our ideas of this world to the Beyond. For the very objection to such a transference on the ground of limitation, *argues a similar transference* of our idea here—that every activity and desire implies a limitation and hence an imperfection! Whatever *else* it is *not*, Madhva's theory of mokṣa is a fulfilment of the highest demands of realistic logic and metaphysics and is *throughout consistent.*

## xi

On the question of the rationality of Brahmapariṇāmavāda, and the interpretation of the texts pertaining to it, Madhva's verdict is generally sound. His criticism of the various types of "Abhinnanimittopādānatva" of Brahman, shows clearly that he has attempted to go to the root of the matter in all cases and would not be content with or cowed down by rhetorical flourishes. It seems fairly self-evident that no Vedāntin (save Bhāskara) can subscribe to actual Pariṇāma of Brahman as such. "Śakti-pariṇāma" especially when it introduces a distinction between one aspect of Brahman and another, ceases any longer to be the same as an actual Brahmapariṇāma. Even the principle of Avidyā (introduced by the Advaitin) is an admission of the force of Madhva's contention. The question of the reality or unreality of Avidyā, seems to have very little relevance to the central issue whether the Brahman *is or is not* to be viewed as the *sole* and *immediate* material cause of the Universe. It helps no one to father the creation on Māyā. Even then, it has to be represented as absolutely dependent on Brahman and hence incapable of disturbing its philosophical oneness. *Dependence* and *not* necessarily *unreality,* would *thus appear to be the solvent of the difficulties.* Madhva is frankly unable to see any harm logical or philosophical if one concedes the reality of this principle (equated with Prakṛti) and subordinates it to Brahman.[6] And in having done so, he does not appear to have been guilty of either bad logic or unsound metaphysics.

6. कौ दोषः सर्वथैवास्ति परिणामि जडं यदि ? (AV. i, 4) . This is a question that is yet to be answered by Absolutist and quasi-Absolutist thinkers.

# Studies in Sanskrit Texts on Temple Architecture with Special Reference to the Tantrasamuccaya

By

N. V. Mallayya

PART II

# अथ प्रथमः पटलः ॥

## देवतावन्दनम् .

श्रीमत् षड्गुणसंभृतं वपुरधिष्ठायानुगृह्णाति यः
श्रद्धाभक्तिपवित्रितोपहरणैःस्वारम्भभूतात्मकैः ।
पूर्णानन्दरसानुभूरपि सदा सन्तर्पितो यज्वन-
स्तं देवं निगमागमाद्यधिगतं नित्यं समाराध्नुयाम ॥ १ ॥

## गुरुदिवाकरवरणम्, ग्रन्थानुबन्धश्च.

गुरुदिवाकरभद्रकटाक्षरुक्स्फुरितहृत्कमलोदरसंभृतम् ।
लिखितयाम्यथ तन्त्रसमुच्चयं गुणनिकाविधिसाधनसिद्धये ॥ २ ॥

## PAṬALA I

### PRAYER

1. May I worship, always, the God who is known through Nigamas (Vedic texts), Āgamas (Purāṇic and other texts) etc., and who assumes a magnificent form, endowed with the six attributes (omniscience and five others); and who, though always enjoying perfect bliss, is yet pleased by the offerings which are sanctified by His worshipper's faith and devotion and which represent the (five) constituent elements of the worshipper.

### HOMAGE TO DIVĀKARA, THE PRECEPTOR AND THE PURPOSE OF THIS WORK

2. I shall set to writing the 'Tantrasamuccaya' collected inside the heart which is the lotus opened by the rays—the kind looks—of the sun of my preceptor—Divākara (by name)—with a view to effecting a repeated study (of what has been learnt).

श्रीशेशसेशहरिसुम्भजिदाम्बिकेयविघ्नेशभूतपतिनामविभिन्नभून्नः ।
वक्ष्ये परस्य पुरुषस्य समानरूपमर्चाविधिं सह पृथक् च विशेषयुक्तम् ॥ ३ ॥

## आराधकलक्षणानि.

वर्णाश्रमाधिकृतकर्मरतस्तदुक्तन्यायात्तवित्तनिचयः परमस्य पुंसः ।
नित्यार्चनादिविधये प्रतिमाप्रतिष्ठाकर्मोन्मना गुरुवरं प्रथमं वृणीत ॥ ४ ॥

## गुरुलक्षणानि.

विप्रः कुलीनः कृतसंस्क्रियौघः स्वधीतवेदागमतत्त्ववेत्ता ।
वर्णाश्रमाचारपरोऽधिदीक्षो दक्षस्तपस्वी गुरुरास्तिकोऽस्तु ॥ ५ ॥

## गुरुकृत्यम्.

यियक्षुणाचार्यवरो वृतोऽथ समूर्तिपः कर्म समातनोतु ।
प्रतिश्रुतं भूमिपरिग्रहादि तीर्थाभिषेकावधिकं क्रमेण ॥ ६ ॥

## सामान्येन प्रतिष्ठास्थानम्.

तीर्थान्ते तटिनीतटे जलनिधेस्तीरे सरित्सङ्गमे
शैलाग्रेऽद्रितटे वनोपवनयोरुद्यानदेशे तथा ।
सिद्धाद्यायतनेषु वा गुरुवरो ग्रामे पुरे पत्तने
देशेऽन्यत्र मनोरमे सुरसमिज्यायै क्षितिं कल्पयेत् ॥ ७ ॥

## विष्णवादीनां ग्रामादिकेषु स्थाननियमः.

प्राचि प्रतीचि च हरौ निजदिश्युमेशे वायौ निसुम्भजिति तारकजित्युदीच्याम् ।
ग्रामादिकेषु निर्ऋतौ गणपार्थनाम्नोर्गृह्णातु भूमिमखिलेष्वपि मध्यतो वा ॥ ८ ॥

3. I shall state in general and in particular the mode of worship of that Supreme Person whose majesty is severally represented by (lit— has but split itself into) the names of Śrīśa (Viṣṇu), Īśa (Śiva), Seśahari (Śiva-Nārāyaṇa), Sumbhajit (Durgā), Āmbikeya (Skanda), Vighneśa (Gaṇapati), Bhūtapati (Śāstā) and the like.

## QUALITIES OF THE WORSHIPPER

4. He who is disposed to duties with reference to the castes and the stages of life, who is enriched with wealth which is the outcome of the observance of the rules prescribed thereon, whose mind tends towards the installation of an image for the performance of daily worship of the Supreme Person must first seek a distinguished 'Guru.'

## QUALITIES OF THE GURU

5. Let this 'Guru' be a priest, a man of high birth, one sanctified by the observance of a host of purificatory rites, a knower of the essence of the 'Vedas' and the 'Āgamas' learnt in the proper manner, a follower of the traditions bearing on the system of caste and the stages of life, one consecrated to religious observances, one who is skilful, and has practised Tapas, and who is a believer in the existence of God.

## THE DUTY OF THE GURU

6. Now, the venerable Ācārya, selected by one desirous of doing religious duties, should, together with the Mūrtipas, carry out in order the work promised beginning with 'Bhūparigraha' (selection of site) and ending with 'Tīrthābhiṣeka' (bathing of an image in connection with the installation ceremony).

## SITUATION OF SITE IN GENERAL

7. Let the revered Guru, for the purpose of installing the deity, fix a site in a sacred place, on the bank of a river, the shore of the sea, the place where rivers (or river and sea) meet, the top and slope of mountains, in a forest, grove or garden, near the abode of the blest, in a village, capital or city or in any other lovely place.

## LOCATION IN GRĀMA ETC. OF A TEMPLE OF VIṢṆU ETC.

8. In the village, etc., select a place in the east and west for Hari, in the Īśāna for Śiva, in Vāyu for Nisumbhajit (Durgā), in the north for Tārakajit (Subrahmaṇya) and in Nirṛti for Gaṇapa and Ārya; or, in the centre for all the gods.

## उत्तममध्यमाधमभूभेदानां लक्षणानि.

गोमर्त्यैः फलपुष्पदुग्धतरुभिश्चाढ्या समा प्राक्प्लवा
स्निग्धा धीररवा प्रदक्षिणजलोपेताशुबीजोद्गमा ।
संप्रोक्ता बहुपांसुरक्षयजला तुल्या च शीतोष्णयोः
श्रेष्ठा भूरधमा समुक्तविपरीता मिश्रिता मध्यमा ॥ ९ ॥

## भूमेर्वर्जनीयाः दोषाः.

वृत्तार्धेन्दुनिभा त्रिपञ्चरसकोणा शूलशूर्पाकृति-
र्मत्स्यानेकपकोलपृष्ठकपिलावक्त्रोपमा मेदिनी ।
भस्माङ्गारतुषास्थिकेशकृमिवल्मीकादिभिः संयुता
वर्ज्या मध्यनता सगर्भकुहरा विस्रा विदिक्स्थापि च ॥ १० ॥

## वर्णवशाद् भूमेर्लक्षणानि.

विप्रादिक्रमतः कुशेषुवनदूर्वाकाशयुक्ता भुव-
स्तुल्यातानवितानसिन्धुररसाब्ध्यंशाधिदीर्घा अपि ।
श्वेतापाटलपीतमेचकरुचश्चाज्यासृगन्नासवा-
मोदाः स्वादुकषायतिक्तकटुकास्वादान्विताश्च स्मृताः ॥ ११ ॥

सङ्कीर्णरूपा वसुधात्र वर्णैर्गन्धै रसैर्वाखिलवर्जनीया ।
एनामनालक्षितवर्णचिह्नां नक्तं परीक्षेत निमित्ततश्च ॥ १२ ॥

उपलिप्य महीतलेऽवटे घटमामं भृतधान्यकं न्यसेत् ।
तदुपर्यपि वर्धमानकं न्यसतु प्राग्वदनो मृदात्मकम् ॥ १३ ॥

कपिलाघृतमात्ममूलतः शतसङ्ख्यममुत्र सिञ्चतु ।
चतसृष्वपि दिक्षु वर्तिकास्तनुयाद् वर्णवशात् सितादिकाः ॥ १४ ॥

## FEATURES OF A SITE OF THE UTTAMA, MADHYAMA AND ADHAMA ORDER

9. That ground is said to be the best which abounds in cows and men and in trees rich in their yield of fruits, flowers and juice; which is even and sloping towards the east; which is soft and producing a hard sound; which has waters running from its left to right; which is quick in its productiveness and rich in soil; which is never scarce in water; and which has heat and cold in moderation. That which is opposite to what has been spoken of is of the lowest type and that is of the middling type which has mixed features.

## FEATURES OF THE LAND TO BE AVOIDED

10. That site is to be avoided which is circular, crescent-like, triangular, pentagonal or hexagonal; which has the shape of a trident or a winnow, the form of the back of a fish or an elephant or a tortoise or the head of a cow; which contains ashes, charcoal, chaff, bones, hair, worms, ant-hills and the like; which is dipping towards the centre and has underground cavities; which sends a foul smell and faces the intermediate points (i.e. corners).

## PREFERENCE OF SITE ON THE BASIS OF CASTE PROFESSION

11. Those sites that have the growth of 'Kuśa,' 'Iṣuvana,' 'Dūrvā,' and 'Kāśa' grass; that have equal length and breadth, length greater than their breadth by one-eighth, one-sixth, and one-fourth; that have their soil white, red, yellow and dark in colour; that have their smell of ghee, blood, food and liquor; and taste sweet, astringent, bitter and pungent—are prescribed in order for Brahmins and the rest.

12. Here, in the examination of site, that which has mixed shape, colour, scent and taste is to be given up by all; but the earth that has the feature of colour that does not admit of any distinguishing mark has to be examined at night in the manner as laid down below.

13. Besmearing the excavated ground (with cow-dung solution) let him (the Mantrin) facing the east, place therein an unburnt pot filled with grain; over this let him place a platter made of earth.

14. Here let him sprinkle cow's ghee after muttering a hundred times 'mūlamantras' (referring to each of the Gods); let him then kindle in the four quarters four wicks of the prescribed colour, white etc.

आच्छाद्य नीतेऽत्र मुहूर्तमात्रे यस्योज्ज्वलेद् वर्तिरमुष्य सा भूः ।
दीप्तासु सर्वास्वनुवर्णयोग्या त्याज्या विशीर्णासु समस्तवर्णैः ॥ १५ ॥

## सुपद्मानामकभूमेर्लक्षणानि.

कर्पूरागरुनालिकेरतिलकैर्दर्भैः कदम्बार्जुनै-
र्मालेयैः क्रमुकेक्षुकेतककुशैः कुन्दारविन्दोत्पलैः ।
पूर्वोदक्प्लवशालिनी बहुजला वा या दरीदृश्यते
सेयं शान्तिकरी सुरेशयजने सूक्ता सुपद्मा मही ॥ १६ ॥

## भद्रा.

तीरं वारिनिधेः श्रिताथ सरितस्तीर्थस्य वा दक्षिणे
व्रीहिक्षेत्रविचित्रिताप्यदिशि यज्ञार्हाङ्घ्रिपैरङ्किता ।
कीर्णा पूर्णफलप्रसूनतरुभिर्योद्यानहृद्यापि वा
भद्रा सा परिगीयते वसुमती प्रीतिप्रदा यज्वनाम् ॥ १७ ॥

## पूर्णा.

प्लक्षन्यग्रोधनिम्बार्जुनवकुलकुलस्थासनाशोकनिष्पा-
वाङ्कोलैर्मालतीचम्पकतिलखदिरैः कोद्रवैर्मुद्रिता वा ।
भूमिर्या भूधराधीश्वरशिखरगता पार्श्वसंस्थाथवाद्रेः
पूर्णा सा पुष्टिदात्री सुरनिलयसमाकल्पने स्वल्पतोया ॥ १८ ॥

15. Then, after the lapse of an interval (of 48 minutes) after the pit has been covered, the earth is good for that caste if the wick prescribed for it remains burning; it is good for every caste if all the wicks remain blazing; it must be shunned by all the castes if all the wicks are gone out.

## THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE CALLED 'SUPADMĀ'

16. That site is called 'Supadmā' which is covered with a growth of 'Karpūra' (*Laurus Camphora*), 'Agaru' (*Amyris Agallocha*), 'Nālikera' (*Cocos nucifera*), 'Tilaka' (*Symplocos racemosa*), 'Darbha' (a sacrificial grass different from Kuśa and Kāśa), 'Kadamba' (*Engenia racimosa*), 'Arjuna' (*Terminalia alta*), 'Māleya' (*Santalum album*), 'Kramuka' (*Areca catechu*), 'Ikṣu' (*Saccharum Spontaneum*), 'Ketaka' (*Pandanus Odoritisimus*), 'Kuśa' (*Poa cynosuroides*), 'Kunda' (*Jasminum pubescens*), 'Aravinda' (*Nelumbium Speciosm*) and 'Utpala' (*Nymphaea Coerulea*); which is naturally sloping eastwards and northwards; wherein is to be met with a cave which contains plenty of water. Such a place confers peace when offerings to deities are made there.

## BHADRĀ

17. That site is termed 'Bhadrā' which is situated on the shore of the ocean or on the bank of a stream or in the vicinity of a sacred place; which is beautiful because of corn-fields in the south; which is marked in the west with trees serviceable in sacrifices; which is covered with trees that are abundant in fruits and flowers and which is charming like a grove: this place gives gratification to devotees.

## PŪRṆĀ

18. That site is known as 'Pūrṇā' which is marked by a growth of 'Plakṣa' (*Ficus Infectoria*), 'Nyagrodha' (*Ficus bengalensis*), 'Nimba' (*Azadirachta indica*), 'Arjuna' (*Terminalia alta*), 'Bakula' (*Mimusops Elenji*), 'Kulattha' (*Dolichos uniflorus*), 'Asana' (*Terminalia tomentosa*), 'Aśoka' (*Polyalthia longifolia*), 'Niṣpa' (*Cajanus indicus*), 'Vāṅgola,' 'Mālati' (*Jasminum pubescens*), 'Campaka' (*Mischelia champaka*), 'Tila' (*Sesamum indicum*), 'Khadira' (*Aracia catechu*), and 'Kodrava' (*Paspalum scrobiculatum*); which stands either on the summit of a mountain or in the valley thereof; which contains a small quantity of water: such a site confers prosperity when temples are built there.

## धूम्रा.

अर्कैर्वेणुविभीतकैः स्नुहियुतैः श्लेष्मातकैः पीलुभिः
सङ्कीर्णा बहुशर्करा च कठिना गर्भान्विता सोषरा ।
गृध्रश्येनवराहवायसशिवाशाखामृगैः सन्ततं
जुष्टा यष्टुरनिष्टदा निगदिता धूम्रा मही सूरिभिः ॥ १९ ॥

तद्वृक्षगुल्मादिकमिष्टशस्त्रैरुच्छिद्य संशोध्य निजास्त्रजापी ।
क्षमां क्षमीकृत्य दिशश्च सम्यग्ज्ञात्वेष्टयुक्त्या प्रमिमीत चैनाम् ॥ २० ॥

## दिग्विभागज्ञानविधानम्.

*साक्षे शङ्कुमिनाङ्गुलं समतले कृत्वा पृथक्कालज-
च्छायाग्रारचितत्रिबिन्दुपरिवृत्त्योत्पाद्य मत्स्यद्वयम् ।
तत्सौषुम्नसिरोत्थसूत्रयुगयोगाच्छङ्कुनाड्यन्तिमं
सूत्रं न्यस्य सुसाधयेद् यमधनेशाशे ततश्चेतरे ॥ २१ ॥

## सीमास्थापनम्.

पुन्नामैकतरूद्भवान् करमितांस्तत्पादनाहान् दृढान्
शङ्कून् प्रागवदनोऽस्त्रमन्त्रमहितान् मध्यादिशर्वान्तिमम् ।
कृत्वा कल्पितसालसीम्नि परितः शङ्कुद्विसंवेष्टितं
स्वास्त्रेण प्रविसार्य सूत्रमपि गृह्णातु क्षितिं सर्वतः ॥ २२ ॥

## गर्तकरणम्.

खात्वा क्षितिं तां पुरुषप्रमाणं जलान्तमश्मावधि वा सुलग्ने ।
पादोनमापूर्य विशुद्धवेद्यां रात्रौ यजेद् दिश्यथ वास्तुमैश्याम् ॥ २३ ॥

* From Supplementary Paṭala No. 12.

## DHŪMRĀ

19. That plot is known by the name of 'Dhūmrā' which is covered with 'Arka' (*Calotropis gigantea*), 'Veṇu' (Bamboo), 'Vibhītaka' (*Beleric myrobalan*), 'Snuhiyut' (*Duphorbia antiquorum*), 'Śleṣmātaka' (*Cordia obliqua*), and 'Pīlu' (*Careva arborea*) ; which is gritty and hard ; which has holes and creatures inside the holes ; which is inhabited by vultures, falcons, pigs, crows, jackals and monkeys ; this earth is pronounced by competent authorities to bring adversity on those who worship there.

20. After having cleared the ground of its trees and creepers by means of instruments which have been duly propitiated and having examined and levelled well the chosen site, let the master carefully ascertain all the quarters and measure the plot of ground required for the edifice.

## PROCESS IN THE FINDING OF CARDINAL POINTS

21. Having levelled the ground which is at the north or south of the equator, erect a gnomon of twelve aṅgulas in height. With three points marked at the end of shadows projected at different times as the centre, describe three circles (of equal radius) and thus produce two (figures which resemble) fishes. Then, extend lengthwise two threads starting from the 'suṣumnaśiras' (madhyanāḍī *i.e.*, the central cord) of the two fishes till they meet at a certain point. From here till the central point at the base of the gnomon lay a thread and thus determine the southern and northern quarters ; and then from this (line) fix the rest (eastern and western quarters).

## FIXING OF THE BOUNDARY

22. Let the master facing the east and chanting '*astramantras*' on pegs which are firm and made of the tree called 'Punna' (*Calophyllum*) and measuring one 'hasta' in height and one-fourth of a 'hasta' in circumference, plant one peg at the centre of the plot first and the rest round the boundary line of the chosen temple-site in the (eight) quarters terminating with the Īśāna quarter ; let him then twine a cord round each of the pegs twice and thus encircle the whole boundary in proper order : thus let him choose a plot for every God.

## DIGGING OF THE FOUNDATION-PIT

23. After having dug this earth (chosen) in the auspicious time either to the depth of a man's height or till the water or rock (in the bottom) is reached, and then having filled the same till one-fourth of the depth is left, on the 'Īśāna' corner of a purified 'Vedi' constructed therein, let him, when the night falls, offer homage to 'Vāstu'.

## गर्ते निधिकलशादिस्थापनम्.

गर्ते तत्र विशोधिते विनिहिताधाराश्ममध्यावटे
धान्याद्याहितविष्टरेऽथ निधिकुम्भं ताम्रजं वाश्मजम् ।
मूलेन प्रणिधाय तत्र विधिवद् रत्नादिपूर्णेऽर्णजं
[1]शैलं कच्छपमत्र नालमुदितं शुल्बोद्भवं विन्यसेत् ॥ २४ ॥

## निधिकुम्भादीनां प्रमाणम्.

[2]स्तम्भोच्चस्य षडंशविस्तृततदष्टांशाधिकोच्चो घटः
पद्मोऽष्टांशसमुच्छ्रयोच्छ्रयनवांशोनप्रथोऽष्टच्छदः ।
अष्टांशायततद्द्विपांशरहितव्यासायतार्धोच्छ्रयः
कूर्मो नागयवाग्रतद्द्विगुणमूला योगनालप्रथा ॥ २५ ॥

## इष्टकानां संख्या प्रमाणं च.

[2]अष्टाशामिहिरैस्त्रिधायततदर्धव्यासपादोच्छ्रिता
यद्वार्काहियुगैर्मितातितिवितत्युत्सेधवत्योऽङ्गुलैः ।
मार्त्तिक्यः पुटपाकलोहितरुचः शैल्योऽथवाष्टेष्टकाः
कर्तव्याश्चतुरूनिताश्चतुरुपेता वा गृहौचित्यतः ॥ २६ ॥

## गर्भपात्रप्रमाणम्.

[2]स्तम्भायामद्वादशांशोपपन्नव्यासं व्यासार्धोच्छ्रयं गर्भपात्रम् ।
तुर्यश्रं तच्छुद्धशुल्बप्रक्लृप्तं स्वोत्सेधाङ्घ्रिघ्नोच्छ्रयोर्ध्वच्छदाढ्यम् ॥ २७ ॥

## इष्टकान्यासविधिः.

प्रासादद्वारस्य वामेतरस्मिन् पार्श्वोद्देशे भावितत्पादुकान्तः ।
भूमिं कृत्वा सुस्थिरां शोधयित्वा मात्वा क्षेत्रं कल्पयेदिष्टकानाम् ॥ २८ ॥

1. Reading from a Malayalam ed. of the Tantrasamuccaya.
2. From Supplementary Paṭala No. 12.

## LAYING OF NIDHIKALAŚA ETC. IN THE FOUNDATION-PIT

24. In that pit which has been sanctified, which has 'Ādhāraśilā' placed in its central cavity, which has been filled with grains etc., in its low space, let him place 'Nidhikumbha' made of copper or stone after due meditation on the '*mūlamantras*'; over this (Nidhikumbha) containing precious stones etc., place a lotus; above this a tortoise made of stone and over this again, a raised 'Nāla,' made of copper.

## THE DIMENSION OF THE NIDHIKUMBHA ETC.

25. The Ghaṭa (ie. Nidhikalaśa) will have a 'vistāra' which is one-sixth of the height of the pillar of the Prāsāda and a height which is one-eighth more than the vistāra; Padma (Śilāpadma) will have a height one-eighth of the height (of the pillar) and vistāra which is less than the height by one ninth of the height, and it will have eight petals; Kūrma (Śilākūrma) will have a length which is one-eighth of the height of the pillar, and vistāra which is one-eighth less than the length and its height will be half this length; the breadth of the Yoganāla will be of the measure of eight yavas (grains) (i.e. one aṅgula) at its extremity and twice this will be the measure of its base.

## DIMENSION AND NUMBER OF BRICKS

26. Bricks must be made either of clay which turns red being baked in a kīln or of stone having three kinds of length of eight, ten or twelve aṅgulas, breadth which is half the length and thickness one-fourth the length; or breadth of eight 'aṅgulas' and length of twelve and thickness of four. They may be eight, four or twelve in number according to the size of the structure.

## DIMENSION OF THE GARBHAPĀTRA

27. Make a 'Garbhapātra' of pure copper, square in shape, which has a vyāsa (i.e. measure, length and breadth) which is one-twelfth of the height of the pillar, height half of this, and the height of its lid one-fourth less than the height (of the Garbhapātra).

## DISPOSITION OF BRICKS (FIRST BRICKS)

28. On the right side of the Prāsādadvāra beneath the door-posts, inside the Pāduka that is to be constructed, having made firm the earth and examined it and measured the same, assign plot for the laying of bricks.

क्षेत्रे चतुष्पदयुते चतुरश्ररूपे रेखे लिखेच्छिखिमरुत्पदयोः पुरोग्रे ।
तच्छिष्टकोष्ठयुजि पिप्पलशङ्कुनोदगग्रे ध्रुवेण सकलेषु शिवेऽस्त्रतो वा ॥ २९ ॥

## गर्भन्यासस्थानम् .

[1]नागैर्भित्तितति विभज्य चतुरो बाह्ये विहायांशका-
नन्तस्त्रीनखिलेषु गोभिरजिते षड् द्वौ च षाण्मातुरे ।
भूतैस्त्रीनपि चैककं वितनुयाद् गर्भं परांशे स्थितं
विप्रस्योपरि पादुकस्य भुवि राज्ञोऽधः क्रमादन्ययोः ॥ ३० ॥[2]

1. From Supplementary Paṭala No. 12.
2. These 30 stanzas are selections from Paṭalas 1 and 12 (T. S. S. Ed.); in respect of numbers they do not follow the T. S. S. Ed.

29. In a four-quartered and square-shaped ground draw lines with the nail prepared out of the Peepal tree in the Vāyu and Agni quarters, their direction pointing towards the East, as well as in the remaining regions (viz. the Īśāna and Nirṛti quarters), their direction pointing northwards (muttering the Praṇava mantra in the case of all Gods or Astramantra in the case of Śiva). There lay the bricks as described above.

## THE PLACE OF GARBHANYĀSA

30. In the temples of all Gods, having divided the vistāra of the (internal) wall by eight, leave four parts outside and three inside and in the remaining part (which is the fifth from outside and fourth from inside) lay the Garbha; in the case of Viṣṇu, in the one part that remains when six parts and two parts are kept outside and inside respectively out of a division into nine parts; and in the case of 'Ṣāṇmātura', in the one part that remains when three parts are kept out and one part inside out of a division into five parts. This Garbha, if it has reference to Brahmin, will be placed above the Pāduka; if to Kshatriya, on the ground level; and if to others beneath in order.

## अथ द्वितीयः पटलः ॥

### सामान्येन वर्गप्रमाणदिक्कल्पनकथनम्.

पादोनत्रिकरादिपञ्चदशहस्ताशाङ्गुलान्तोत्तरे-
ष्वष्टाष्टाङ्गुलवृद्धितोऽन्तरभवद्योनिप्रभेदेष्वथ ।
प्रत्यक्प्राग्वदनक्रमेण विहितेष्वल्पेषु वान्येषु वा
प्रासादेषु विशिष्टजातिषु निजेष्टं कारयेत् कारुभिः ॥ १ ॥

### प्रासादस्य ईशादिक्रमेण दिक्कल्पनम्.

ईशादिप्रेतेशपर्यन्तदिक्स्थाः प्रासादा ग्रामादिकेषु ध्वजोत्थाः ।
गोयोन्युत्थाः शेषदिक्संस्थिताः स्युस्तत्स्थाप्यार्चा चेष्यते तत्सयोनिः ॥ २ ॥

### योन्यादिकम्.

इष्टातानवितानमाननिचये त्रिघ्नेऽष्टभिर्भाजिते
शेषो योनिरिह व्ययो मुनियुजाथायोऽष्टनिघ्नेऽरुणैः ।
ऋक्षैर्ऋक्षमवाप्तिरत्र तु वयो ज्ञेयं तिथिस्त्रिंशता
वारो भूमिधरैर्निधिप्रगुणिते धर्माहृते वा व्ययः ॥ ३ ॥

### अष्टयोनयः, तेषां फलं च.

ध्वजधूमसिंहकुक्कुरवृषखरगजवायसाः क्रमेण स्युः ।
प्रागादियोनयोऽष्टौ तेष्वयुजः सम्पदे युजो विपदे ॥ ४ ॥

## PAṬALA II

### A GENERAL REFERENCE TO TYPE, SIZE AND ORIENTATION

1. Get built by artisans, according to one's taste, a temple coming under the 'Alpa Prāsāda' class, in which the 'uttara' will have its measurements beginning with two and three-fourths cubits and increasing by eight aṅgulas ending with fifteen cubits and ten aṅgulas, and which will (consequently) have different yonis and facing towards the West and East; or, a temple coming under any other class.

### ORIENTATION OF TEMPLE, ACCORDING TO ITS LOCATION IN ĪŚA ETC.

2. In places such as a village, etc., the temple located in the quarters ranging from the Īśāna to the Yama shall have the 'Dhavaja Yoni,' Those standing in the remaining quarters will have the 'Vṛṣa Yoni.' And the image to be insalled, it is desired, should possess a similar Yoni.

### YONI AND OTHER FORMULAS

3. '*Yoni*' is the remainder that results when the perimeter is multiplied by three and this product divided by eight; and here, when (the same product is) divided by fourteen, the remainder is '*Vyaya.*' '*Āya*' (is the remainder that results) when (the perimeter is) multiplied by eight and (the product) divided by twelve; '*Ṛkṣa*' (is the remainder) when (the same product is) divided by twenty-seven and the quotient herein is to be understood as the '*Vayas.*' '*Tithi*' (is the remainder resulting) when (the perimeter is multiplied by eight and the product) divided by thirty, and '*Vāra*' is the remainder when the same product is divided by seven. As an alternative, '*Vyaya*' is the remainder that results when the perimeter is multiplied by nine and the product divided by ten.

### THE EIGHT YONIS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCE.

4. Beginning with the eastern-most quarter, there are eight 'Yonis' in order called 'Dhvaja,' 'Dhūma,' 'Siṁha,' 'Kukkura', 'Vṛṣa', 'Khara', 'Gaja' and 'Vāyasa'. Of these, the odd yonis are beneficent, the even ones adverse.

## आयव्ययौ.

आयाधिक्यं व्ययतः सम्पाद्यं सर्वथाऽन्यथापत्तिः ।
नक्षत्रादिशुभत्वं ज्योतिःशास्त्रादिभिः सुविज्ञेयम् ॥ ५ ॥

## पञ्च-वयांसि.

बालत्वं कौमारं यौवनमथ वार्धकं च निधनं च ।
पञ्च वयांस्येष्वन्त्यं नेष्टं शिष्टानि वास्तुनीष्टानि ॥ ६ ॥

## प्रासादौन्नत्यम्.

धाम्नो व्यासे शक्करीद्वन्द्वभक्ते मित्रेन्द्रेध्मांशैः समस्तांशतश्च ।
विस्तृत्या संयुक्तया पादुकादिस्तूप्यग्रान्तोऽभ्युच्छ्रयः स्याच्चतुर्धा ॥ ७ ॥

## स्तम्भाधिष्ठानयोरुन्नतिः.

गेहे त्रिदोर्वर्गभवे द्विदोर्मितान् स्तम्भांस्ततोऽब्ध्यङ्गुलवर्धितान् क्रमात् ।
चतुष्कराद्युत्तरवर्गजेषु तान् करोत्वधिष्ठानमतोऽर्धसंमितम् ॥ ८ ॥

अङ्गाद्यैरुदयोत्तरान्तरगतोन्मानं विभज्य क्रमात्
संख्यानैः शिवपञ्चिमैर्निगदिते स्तम्भोच्छ्रये स्वेच्छया ।
अंशं योजयतु क्वचित् त्यजतु वा मासूरके स्वोच्छ्रयं
भङ्क्त्वाङ्गादिनवान्तिमैर्विरहयेद् विंशं यथोक्तोच्छ्रयात् ॥ ९ ॥

## स्तम्भविस्तारः.

भक्ते प्रत्युत्तरान्तर्गतचरणसमुन्मानकेऽष्टाङ्कदिग्भि-
स्तेष्वेकांशात्तमूलप्रततितदुरगांशादिहीनाग्रतानान् ।
दारुस्तम्भांस्तदर्धे विहिततितिदलाग्न्याब्धभागोनतानान्
कुड्यस्तम्भांश्च कुड्ये रचयतु चरणाग्रप्रतानोऽत्र दण्डः ॥ १० ॥

## ĀYA AND VYAYA

5. An excess of 'Āya' over 'Vyaya' should always be secured; otherwise, there is adversity. The auspiciousness of the 'Nakṣatras' etc., should be known through the science of astrology and the like.

## THE FIVE AGES

6. Five are the Ages of a building, namely, 'Bālatva' (infancy), 'Kaumāra' (boyhood), 'Yauvana' (manhood), 'Vārdhakya' (old age) and 'Nidhana' (death); of these the last is undesirable and the remaining four are desirable in the case of a building.

## THE HEIGHT OF A BUILDING

7. When the vistāra (breadth) of the building is divided by twenty-eight, twelve parts or fourteen parts or twenty-one parts or all the twenty-eight parts, added on to the vistāra, any one of these four will be the height of the building beginning with the 'Pāduka' and ending with the top of the 'Stūpikā'.

## THE HEIGHT OF ADHIṢṬHĀNA AND STAMBHA

8. In the class of buildings coming under the three cubits measure type, the pillar will be two cubits high; and in the succeeding class of buildings coming under four cubits, five cubits etc., the height of the pillar is to be increased by four aṅgulas in order. The Adhiṣṭhāna (basement) should be made half the height of the pillar.

9. Having divided the height between the 'udaya' and 'uttara' by any number beginning with six and ending with eleven add one part thereof to or subtract the same from the height laid down for the pillar or the Māsūraka (basement), if desired. Similarly, the height of the basement being divided by any number beginning with six and ending with nine, deduct any one part thereof from the height above prescribed (for the basement).

## THE BREADTH OF THE COLUMN.

10. The height of a pillar from 'Prati' to 'Uttara' being divided into eight, nine or ten parts, one of these parts will be the 'vistāra' of the pillar at the base, while the 'vistāra' at the top will be less than the same at the base by one-eighth or one-ninth or one-tenth thereof. Thus construct wooden pillars (Dārustambhas). 'Kuḍyastambhas' (pilasters) may be built in the wall, in which case the 'vistāra' will be less than that of the wooden pillar by half, one-third, or one-fourth. Here, the 'vistāra' at the top of the pillar is known as 'Daṇḍa.'

## अधिष्ठानादप्यधोदेशे पक्षान्तरेण कल्पनीयस्योपपीठस्य क्लृप्तिः.

मासूरोच्चे विभक्ते शिखिविशिखकरैः क्ष्मेक्षणेन्द्वंशतोऽर्धां-
शोर्ध्वं पादांशवृद्ध्या द्विगुणितचरमं योजयेद् वोपपीठम् ।
दिग्भक्तेंऽशैः शशाङ्कादिभिरिषुचरमैरेकसार्धद्विलोकै-
र्दण्डैर्वा निर्गतं चारचयतु विलसत्स्वाङ्गभङ्ग्याभिरामम् ॥ ११ ॥

## अधिष्ठानादधोभागे पृथक्कल्पनीयस्य पद्मस्य क्लृप्तिः.

इष्टाधिष्ठानोच्छ्रूयं संविभज्य सङ्ख्याभिः श्रुत्यादिनन्दान्तिमाभिः ।
कुर्यादेकांशेन तूपान (ड ? द) न्ते पद्मं धामोत्सेधतोऽद्रोऽधिकं स्यात् ॥ १२ ॥

## अधिष्ठानम्; तदवयवविशेषप्रमाणम्.

मासूरे मिहिरद्वयांशिनि ततोंऽशैः पादुकं पावकै-
रष्टाभिर्जगतीं स्वरैः कुमुदकं शेषे दशांशेंऽशकैः ।
त्रिद्व्यग्न्यश्विमितैर्गलं विरचयेत् कम्पान् गलं पट्टिकां
प्रत्युद्यन्मकरास्यकादिरुचिरां सिंहादिभिश्चोज्ज्वलाम् ॥ १३ ॥

## पक्षान्तरेणाप्यधिष्ठानविभागः.

वास्त्वाधारसमुच्छ्रूये प्रकृतिभक्ते वा त्रिभिः पादुकं
छन्दोभिर्जगतीं रसैः कुमुदकं चैकेन तत्पट्टिकाम् ।
भागाभ्यां गलपादकान् विरचयेदर्धांशतः पट्टिकां
क्षुद्रां सार्धधरांशकेन महतीं स्वांशोल्लसद्राजनाम् ॥ १४ ॥

## प्रत्युत्पन्नक्रमपादबन्धावधिष्ठानविशेषौ.

मासूरेंऽशैर्दिनेशांशिनि सति जगतीकैरवे श्रुत्युपायै-
स्तच्छिष्टैः पट्टिकामन्तरिमपि रचयेद् वाजनं च प्रतिं च ।
प्रत्युत्पन्नक्रमाख्ये क्रम इति कथितः पट्टिकान्तं तथातः
खण्डान् सार्धैकतो वाजनमपि सदलैकांशतः पादबन्धे ॥ १५ ॥

## THE HEIGHT OF THE UPAPĪṬHA, AN OPTIONAL MEMBER BENEATH THE ADHIṢṬHĀNA

11. Add an 'Upapīṭha', the height of which may be one part, two parts or one part when the height of the basement is divided by three, five or two respectively, or it may be half plus a quarter or increasing by a quarter it may reach twice the height of the basement; and give the 'Upapīṭha' a projection which may be one to five tenths or which may be one, one and a half, two or three Daṇḍas. It must be embellished by the beauty of its own mouldings.

## THE HEIGHT OF 'PADMA,' ANOTHER OPTIONAL MEMBER BENEATH THE ADHIṢṬHĀNA.

12. Having divided the height of the chosen basement by any number beginning with four and ending with nine, construct a 'Padma' any one of the parts high below the 'Upānaha.' This is in excess (i.e. exclusive of) the total height of the temple.

## ADHIṢṬHĀNA—THE PROPORTION OF ITS SEVERAL MOULDINGS

13. The height of the basement being divided into twenty-four parts, construct the 'Pāduka' with three parts thereof, 'Jagatī' with eight parts, 'Kumuda' with seven parts; dividing the remaining six parts into ten, make 'Gala' with three parts, 'Kampa' with two parts, 'Gala' with three parts and 'Paṭṭikā' with two parts, the last of these mouldings being made beautiful by such adornments as 'makarāysa', 'siṃha' and the like.

## AN ALTERNATIVE TYPE OF ADHIṢṬHĀNA—ITS DIVISIONS

14. When the height of the basement (vāstvādhāra) is divided into twenty-one parts, make 'Pāduka' with three parts thereof; 'Jagatī' with seven; 'Kumuda' with six; its 'Paṭṭikā' with one; 'Gala' and 'Pāda' with two; small 'Paṭṭikā' with half and large 'Paṭṭikā' with one and a half, it being decorated with 'Vājanas'.

## TWO OTHER ALTERNATIVE TYPES—'PRATYUTPANNAKRAMA' AND 'PĀDABANDHA'

15. When the height of the basement is divided into twelve parts, construct 'Jagatī' and 'Kumuda' with four parts each; with the remaining parts make (successively upwards) 'Paṭṭikā', 'Antarī', 'Vājana', and 'Prati'. Such is the proportion laid down in the variety of basement called 'Pratyutpannakrama.' In (the basement known as) 'Pādabandha', however, it (*i.e.*, the order) is the same till the end of 'Paṭṭikā', while above it construct 'Khaṇḍaka' (or Antarī) and 'Vājana' with one and a half parts each.

## अवयवानां निर्गमः.

यावत् स्वायोच्चमानं गमयतु जगतीं बाह्यतो मानसूत्रात्
तत्तुल्यं कैरवं चोच्छ्रयसमचरणोनार्धपादांशकं च ।
शिष्टं तत्पट्टिकाब्जादिकमपि गमयेन्मानसूत्रात् समन्तात्
तत्तच्छोभानुरूपं गमयतु जगतीसूत्रतः पादुकं च ॥ १६ ॥

## अधिष्ठानतलविभागकल्पनम्.

चित्वेत्यधिष्ठानमिहानुरूपं समं तलीकृत्य शिलाप्रतानैः ।
विभज्य गर्भान्तरबाह्यभित्तितन्मध्यनाडी रचयेद् यथार्हम् ॥ १७ ॥

## गर्भगृहव्यासः.

वह्न्याद्दितिथ्यवधिकौजविभागभक्ते व्यासे गृहस्य नयनाद्युरगान्तिमांशैः ।
पञ्चांशकैश्च वसुभागयुतेऽर्धतश्च गर्भालयस्य विततिर्नवधोदितेति ॥ १८ ॥

## गर्भभित्तिप्रमाणम्.

बाह्या गृहव्यासगजांशतः स्याद्भित्तिः परा गर्भगजांशतश्च ।
नाडी समन्तादुभयान्तराले संमेल्य वा भित्तियुगं गृहेऽल्पे ॥ १९ ॥

## अल्पप्रासादे पक्षान्तरेण गर्भादीनां विभागः.

विस्तारेऽल्पगृहे क्वचिद् विशिखभक्तेऽन्तःपदे पीठिकां
पङ्क्त्या गर्भगृहं करोतु परितः पङ्क्त्या च भित्तिं घनाम् ।
तस्मिन् नन्दविभाजिते सति विधायैवं ततो वीथिकां
भित्तिं चोभयपङ्क्तितो विरचयेद् द्वारं च कोष्ठेऽग्रतः ॥ २० ॥

## THE PROJECTION OF MOULDINGS.

16. Beyond the mānasūtra let 'Jagatī' project to the extent of its own height or as much as would give the same Yoni; 'Kumuda' equal to it (i.e. the same projection as Jagatī). The rest (of the parts) like its 'Paṭṭikā', 'Padma', etc., should be made to project beyond the 'mānasūtra' on every side, each as much as its own part, three-fourth or half or one-fourth of its height according as beauty demands. The 'Pāduka' should project beyond the Jagatī (sūtra).

## THE MARKING OF THE SURFACE OF ADHIṢṬHĀNA

17. After building up the suitable basement (as described) here, and making it even by paving it with stones, mark out properly the divisions into 'Garbha', 'Āntarabhitti' 'Bāhyabitti' and 'Madhya-nāḍī' (between the internal and external walls).

## THE BREADTH OF THE GARBHAGṚHA.

18. When the breadth of the Gṛha (main structure) is divided by any odd number beginning with three and ending with fifteen, the Garbhālaya may be given a breadth with parts beginning with two and ending with eight thereof; or, it may be five parts when the breadth is divided by eight; or, it may also be half the breadth: thus the breadth of the Garbhagṛha is laid down in nine alternative proportions.

## THE THICKNESS OF THE WALLS OF THE SANCTUM

19. The outer wall will be one-eighth of the breadth of the 'Gṛha', while the other (i.e. the inner wall) will be one-eighth of the breadth of the 'Garbha'. All around, in the interspace between the two (walls) (runs) the 'Nāḍī'. In the case of an 'Alpagṛha' the two walls may be combined (into a single wall).

## ALTERNATIVE DISPOSITION OF GARBHA ETC. IN AN ALPAPRĀSĀDA

20. In the case of an 'Alpagṛha', when the breadth and length are divided by five each, construct in the central quarter the 'Pīṭhikā'; in the row (of quarters surrounding) make the Garbhagṛha; in the row (still) surrounding construct the thick wall. When the same (i.e. length and breadth) are divided by nine and (Pīṭhikā and Garbhagṛha) constructed as before, make a 'Vīthikā' and outer wall in the two rows (of quarters surrounding) beyond. And in the front quarter, at the outer row, construct a gateway.

## अम्बुमार्गस्य प्रणालस्य च स्थानं प्रमाणं च.

प्रत्यन्ते वा गलान्ते रचयतु तदुदङ्मध्यसूत्रेऽम्बुमार्गं
सोमेशानान्तरोद्यद्वसुनवदशभागादिकं वा व्यतीत्य ।
मासूरोत्सेधमात्रं चरणविरहितं वार्धवृद्धं प्रणालं
निर्यातं बाह्यतोऽन्तर्विनिहितमधिकुड्यं तदर्धांशमात्रम् ॥ २१ ॥

## प्रणालस्य प्रमाणं भूषणं च.

स्वायामाग्न्यंशकादिप्रविततनिजमूलानलांशादिविस्ती-
र्णाग्रं विस्तारतुल्यत्रिपददलघनं त्र्यंशक्लृप्ताम्बुमार्गम् ।
व्यात्तव्यालास्यमध्यप्रसृमरनिजमूलोज्ज्वलं गोमुखं त-
न्मुक्तादामादिवल्लीवलयपरिगतं शुण्डुभिर्मण्डितं च ॥ २२ ॥

## स्तम्भानां संख्या स्थानं च.

स्तम्भाः कोणचतुष्कमध्यविनिवेश्याः स्युः प्रतेरूर्ध्वतः
सामान्येन समान्तराः सुरविमानेषूदिता द्वादश ।
एते विंशतिरीशदोःप्रभृतिकेष्वेतेषु ते नैकधा
चोक्ताः स्वाकृतिभूषणक्रमवशादेष्वर्पयेच्चोत्तरम् ॥ २३ ॥

## स्तम्भानामाकृतिः.

कार्याः स्युश्चरणा युगाष्टनृपकोणाः सर्वतो वर्तुला
विस्तारत्रिगुणोपरित्रिगुणविस्तारोन्मिताष्टाश्रकाः ।
मूलोद्भावितकर्णसूत्रचतुरश्रोर्ध्वांशवृत्ताः पुनः
शुण्डोद्भेदविचित्रवृत्तरुचिरा वारब्धगेहोचिताः ॥ २४ ॥

## THE DISPOSITION AND LENGTH OF THE WATER-COURSE AND THE WATER-CHUTE.

21. Make an 'Ambumārga' (watercourse) at the end of 'Prati' or 'Gala' along the 'Madhyasūtra' running north and moved from the central line (towards the east) by one-eighth, one-ninth or one-tenth etc., of the length between 'Soma' and 'Īśāna'. The 'Praṇāla' (water-chute) which has projection outside will have a length which is as much as, three-fourth of, or one and a half times the height of the basement; half of this (length) will remain inside the wall.

## THE DIMENSION AND ORNAMENTATION OF THE WATER-CHUTE

22. The breadth of this (waterchute) at its base will be one-third etc., of its length and a third etc., of this breadth at the base will be the breadth at its extremity. Its thickness will be as much as or three-fourth or half of the breadth. The breadth of the passage for water will be a third (of the breadth of the water-chute). It (the water-chute) must be graceful by its base springing from the open mouth of a 'Vyāla'; it must have ornamentations such as the pearl-strings, creepers and armlets encircling and Śuṇḍu (trunk of an elephant) adorning it; its extremity will be made in the shape of a 'Gomukha' (cow's head).

## THE NUMBER AND DISPOSITION OF COLUMNS.

23. In temples of Gods commonly (i.e. coming under the common (small) measure type), pillars are said to be twelve in number, which should be posted above Prati, at the four corners and in the middle, the interstices (between the pillars) being equal. In those (temples) which have eleven cubits measure etc., they are held to be twenty. They are described in a variety of ways on the basis of their difference in shape and ornamention. On these (pillars) place the 'uttara'.

## THE SHAPE OF COLUMNS

24. Pillars ('Caraṇas') may be made wholly four-faced, eight-faced, sixteen-faced or circular; or octagonal from above three times the 'vistāra' of the column to a height which is measured three times the vistāra; or again, square at the base to the extent of its Karṇasūtra (of the base) and in the above portion circular. They must be beautified by such ornamentations like the split reed and circular motifs (like the armlets), as befits the temple begun (for construction).

10

## अधः प्रारभ्य ऊर्ध्वं क्रमात् स्तम्भावयवाः.

ओमां कुर्वीत दण्डद्वयततचरणोच्चां घटं दण्डयुग्म-
व्यासं साङ्घ्र्याद्दिदण्डोच्छ्रयमुदधिततां दण्डतोऽङ्घ्र्यूनतीव्राम् ।
मण्डिं दण्डप्रथाङ्घ्र्यंशकरहितघनं वीरकाण्डं त्रिसार्धे-
षूदन्वद्दण्डदीर्घो चरणततदर्धोच्छ्रयां पोतिकां च ॥ २५ ॥

## द्वारस्थानकल्पनम्.

भित्तिव्यासमितैर्विभज्य बहिरन्तः पञ्चसप्तांशकान्
कृत्वा कल्पितसूत्रसंस्थनिजमध्यद्वारयोगान्यथ ।
मध्यान्मध्यमतीत्य दिक्षु रचयेद् द्वाराणि तूर्ध्वं प्रते-
रग्रयद्वारमृते घनानि कृतशोभान्यूर्ध्वतस्तोरणैः ॥ २६ ॥

## बिम्बद्वारोत्सेधविस्तारौ.

गर्भागारप्रताने शिववसुदिनकृच्छैलतिथ्यंशितेंऽशै-
र्बिम्बद्वारोच्छ्रयः स्याद् गिरिशरतुरगाम्नायमातङ्गसङ्ख्यः ।
उत्सेधेऽत्रैकविंशत्यतिधृतितिथिविश्वाङ्कभक्ते प्रक्लृप्ते
व्यासो दिङ्नन्दशैलोर्म्युदधिपरिमितांशैः क्रमात् कल्पनीयः ॥ २७ ॥

## लिङ्गद्वारोत्सेधविस्तारौ.

व्यासे गर्भनिकेतनस्य दहनेषुद्वारनेत्रांशिते
लिङ्गद्वारसमुच्छ्रयं वितनुयाद् द्वित्रीषुचन्द्रांशकैः ।
तस्मिन् द्वारसमुच्छ्रयेऽथ नयनात्यष्टीशशैलांशिते
तद्विस्तारमिलामहोरगशराग्न्यंशैः क्रमात् कल्पयेत् ॥ २८ ॥

## THE PARTS OF THE PILLAR FROM BOTTOM UPWARDS.

25. Make an 'Oma', two Daṇḍas in breadth and one-fourth Daṇḍa in height; 'Ghaṭa', two Daṇḍas in breadth and one and one-fourth etc., (*i.e.*, one and a half or one and three-fourth) Daṇḍas in height; 'Maṇḍi', four Daṇḍas in breadth and three-fourth of a Daṇḍa in thickness; 'Vīrakāṇḍa', one Daṇḍa in breadth and three-fourth of a Daṇḍa in thickness; and 'Potikā', three, five and a half or four Daṇḍas in length, with a breadth equal to the breadth of the base of the pillar and thickness half of this.

## THE DISPOSITION OF THE DOORS.

26. Dividing the thickness of the wall into twelve parts and giving five and seven parts outside and inside respectively mark out a line; then construct doors (Dvāras) on all the (four) sides above Prati, they being so situated that the middle-line of their jambs (Dvāraśākhās) coincides with the demarcating sūtra designed, while the centre of the door is a little deviated from the centre of the Prāsāda. Excepting the front-door, all will be 'Ghanadvāras' which are adorned in their above with 'toraṇas.'

## THE HEIGHT AND BREADTH OF THE BIMBADVĀRA.

27. When the breadth of the 'Garbhāgāra' is divided into eleven, eight, twelve, seven, or fifteen parts, the height of the 'Bimbadvāra' (door of the sanctum where a Biṁba or image is installed) will be seven, five, seven, four or eight parts thereof; and its breadth is to be assigned ten, nine, seven, six, or four parts when the height is divided into twenty-one, nineteen, fifteen, thirteen or nine parts.

## THE HEIGHT AND BREADTH OF THE LIṄGADVĀRA

28. When the breadth of the Garbhagṛha is divided into three, five, nine or two parts, the height of the Liṅgadvāra (i.e. the door in front of the Liṅga Shrine) will be two, three or five parts or one part thereof in order. The height of the door being divided into two, seventeen, eleven or seven parts, its breadth will be given one part, eight parts, five parts or three parts thereof.

## स्तम्भप्रमाणवशात् पक्षान्तरेण द्वारप्रमाणं द्वारशाखादीनां लक्षणं च.

कुर्यात् सर्वसुरेषु शैलवसुनन्दांशांशितेऽङ्घ्रयुच्छ्रये
द्वारोत्सेधमिहैकभागरहितं विस्तीर्णमात्मार्धतः ।
योगौ स्तम्भसमाधिपाददलविस्तीर्णौ स्फुरद्वाजनौ
विस्तारार्धघनौ भुवङ्गमपतङ्गाढ्यौ च मूलाग्रयोः ॥ २९ ॥

## भुवङ्गमपतङ्गयोः प्रमाणम्.

द्वारोत्सेधनियुक्तशेषचरणोत्सेधे शरांशीकृते
द्व्यंशेनाधरपट्टिकां मितघनां सार्धेन वाङ्कांशिते ।
हीनां वाजनकेन योगविततां शिष्टांशतः पट्टिका-
मूर्ध्वस्थामथ मङ्गलाढ्यफलकां युत्त्योर्ध्वपट्टयूर्ध्वतः ॥ ३० ॥

## कवाटलक्षणम्.

दण्डाढ्यङ्गमतङ्गजांशबहलं तावद्युतद्वार्दल
व्यासं मूलशिखायुतं दृढतरं कार्यं कवाटद्वयम् ।
कार्या वामकवाटरोपितपराग्भागार्धतीव्रा तत-
स्तद्द्विघ्नप्रतता च सूत्रफलका सूद्यस्तनाद्युज्ज्वला ॥ ३१ ॥

## कवाटयोः यन्त्रविशेषाः भूषणानि च.

ऊर्ध्वाधरभ्रमरकार्गलसन्धिपालप्रक्षेपणीयवलयान्यपि पत्रकाणि
तिर्यन्च्युदङ्घ्रि पुलकार्तवकुड्मलानि सश्रीमुखेन्दुशकलानि कवाटयोः स्युः ॥ ३२ ॥

## AN ALTERNATIVE MEASURE OF THE DOOR PROPORTIONATE TO THE MEASURE OF THE PILLAR AND THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JAMBS, ETC.

29. In the case of all Gods, when the height of the pillar is divided into seven, eight, nine or ten parts, make the height of the Dvāra less than that of the pillar by any one part thereof; its breadth will be half of its height. The 'Yogas' (door-posts) will have breadth which is as much as or one and one-fourth or one and a half times the breadth of the pillar and thickness half of its breadth. They will be beautified by 'Vājanas' and furnished with 'Bhuvaṅgama' (the lower piece) at the base and 'Pataṅga' (lintel) at the top.

## THE DIMENSION OF BHUVAṆGAMA AND PATAṆGA.

30. The height of the pillar which results when the height of the door is deducted (therefrom), having been divided into five parts, construct 'Adharapaṭṭikā' (lower plate) with two parts thereof for its thickness or with two and half parts if the division is into nine parts. Without the Vājanaka, its breadth will be as much as that of the door-post. With the remaining parts make the 'Ūrdhvapaṭṭikā' (lintel) and above the Ūrdhvapaṭṭikā a suitable plank bearing auspicious figures (like that of Lakṣmi).

## THE DIMENSION OF THE PANELS.

31. A pair of strong 'Kavāṭas' (panels) must be made, the thickness of the panel being one-fourth, one-sixth or one-eight of a Daṇḍa, and breadth half that of the door plus this thickness. It will have a 'Nāla' at the bottom and 'Śikhā' at the top. And a 'Sūtraphalakā' fixed on to the left panel at its back, having a thickness half that of the panel, a breadth twice that (i.e. twice the thickness of the panel) and ornamentations such as bulging breasts should be set.

## MECHANICAL DEVICES AND ORNAMENTATIONS OF DOOR PANELS.

32. The panels will be furnished with (mechanical devices such as) 'Bhramarakas' (hinges) at the top and base, 'Argala' (inner bolt), 'Sandhipāla' (protector of joints, *i.e.*, 'Sūtraphalakā'), 'Prakṣepaṇīya' (outer bolt) 'Valayas' (chain), and (adornments such as) 'Patrakas' (leaf-like metallic bands) both lengthwise and breadthwise, 'Pulakas,' 'Ārtavas' and 'Kuḍmalas' (nails in the form of flowers in the three stages of bloom, namely the blossomed, semi-open and closed bud) and 'Induśakalas' (ornaments in the shape of crescents) accompanied by 'Śrīmukha' (face of the Goddess Śrī).

## सोपानलक्षणम्.

अग्रघद्वारभुवङ्गमस्थलसमारब्धान्यधोऽधः क्रमात्
सोपानानि समानि सारशिलया चिन्वीत:यावत्तलम् ।
अध्यर्धद्विगुणात्तदण्डविपुलानि द्वारशाखाद्वयी-
पार्श्वोद्यन्मकरास्यनिःसृतलतारुद्धोभयान्तानि च ॥ ३३ ॥

## घनद्वारलक्षणम्.

अग्रघद्वारप्रततिमहिभिः संविभज्याशुगांशैः
क्लृप्तव्यासं रचयतु घनद्वारमन्यत्रिदिक्स्थम् ।
द्विघ्नव्यासायतमधिदलद्विघ्नतेत्याततं वा
सूद्यद्योगप्रकटितकवाटादिकस्वाङ्गदीप्तम् ॥ ३४ ॥

## तोरणलक्षणम्.

स्तम्भे दिङ्नन्दनागांशिनि झषमनलांशेन शेषेण पादौ
व्यासं स्तम्भार्धतोऽध्याशुगरसमितदण्डेन वा तत्र कुर्यात् ।
पत्रादीद्धार्धचन्द्रात्मकमथ मकरास्यादिमत् पञ्चभुग्नं
कर्तव्यं तोरणं तद् विविधखगलसन्नक्रतुण्डोज्ज्वलं च ॥ ३५ ॥

## भित्तिकरणम्.

प्रत्युत्तरान्तर्विरचय्य भित्तिं ततः समन्तात् सुदृढैः शिलाद्यैः ।
तां भूषयेद् वेदिकयाङ्घ्रिमूले तदूर्ध्वतश्चोज्ज्वलपञ्जराद्यैः ॥ ३६ ॥

## वेदिकालक्षणम्.

प्रत्युत्सेधेन पादायतिवसुमुनिषड्भागतोऽध्यर्धकेन
द्वित्रिघ्नेनाङ्घ्रितारेण च भवतु समोऽभ्युच्छ्र्यो वेदिकायाः ।
उत्सेधे द्व्यंशितेऽधोवधि गुणरशनान्तर्यथाष्टाद्रिषड्भा-
गेंऽशैः कम्पाब्जकम्पाः शशिकरशशिभिः शेषतोऽधोगलं च ॥ ३७ ॥

## DESCRIPTION OF STEPS.

33. Starting from the place of Bhuvaṅgama of the front (main) door and descending down to the floor (i.e. level of the ground) in order, construct with hard stone symmetrical and even number of steps which are one and a half or two Daṇḍas in length and covered at their extremity with creeper-like construction issuing from out of the mouth of Makara, rising from either side of the two door-posts.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE GHANADVĀRAS.

34. Construct on (each of) the other three sides a 'Ghanadvāra' (false door) whose breadth consists of five parts when the breadth of the front door is divided into eight parts, and whose height is twice or two and a half times the breadth. It should be embellished by its parts such as the graceful posts, panels and the like.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE TORAṆA (PATRA, MAKARA AND CITRA).

35. The height of the pillar being divided into ten, nine or eight parts, make a fish with three parts thereof and with the rest the two pādas (lit-legs, pillars of the Toraṇa). The breadth may be half the height of the pillar or four, five or six Daṇḍas. It may be constructed in the form of a crescent (half-moon) decorated with Patra (foliage) and other motifs ; or with five bends endowed with the ornamentations such as the mouth of the 'Makara'; or it may be fully embellished with varied kinds of birds and heads of sharks.

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE WALL.

36. Then, construct all around, a wall in the interspace between the Prati and the Uttara with enduring material like the stone and beautify it with a 'Vedikā' at the foot of Anghri and with ornamented 'Pañjaras' and the like at the top.

## THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VEDIKĀ

37. The height of the 'Vedikā' may be the same as that of the 'Prati', or one-eighth, one-seventh or one-sixth of the height of the pillar (pāda); or one and a half, two or three times the breadth of the pillar. This height of the 'Vedikā' being divided into two parts give 'Guṇaraśanā' (three-fold band) till the lower half, and 'Antarī' below; or, when the division (of the height) is made by the numbers eight, seven or six, make 'Kampa', 'Abja' (Padma), and 'Kampa' with one part, two parts and one part thereof and 'Gala' with the remainder below.

## भित्तिभूषणानि.

प्रासादः सकलोऽङ्घ्रितोरणचतुर्द्वारान्वितो मण्डित-
स्तम्भाभ्यन्तरजालपञ्जरयुतो वा पञ्चहस्तादिकः ।
युक्तो मूलतले विदिक्स्थितचतुष्कूटैः परस्तत्परः
शालाकूटकनासिकादिविलसज्जालोज्ज्वलत्पञ्जरः ॥ ३८ ॥

## शालादीनां प्रमाणं स्थानं च.

कुड्ये पङ्क्त्यादिभक्ते विदिशि विरचयेत् कूटमेकांशविस्ता-
रायामं द्व्यंशदीर्घां दिशि दिशि विततामेकभागेन शालाम् ।
शालाकूटान्तराले चरणविरहितांशोन्मितां नासिकां त-
त्पार्श्वद्वन्द्वे सजालं चरणविरहितांशादतः पञ्जरं च ॥ ३९ ॥

## शालाकूटयोर्लक्षणम्.

धाम्नोऽष्टांशमितोऽथवा प्रतिमुखैः स्तूप्यन्तिमैः संयुतः
प्रासादाकृतिकश्च कूट उदितो मध्यस्फुरन्नासिकः ।
शाला तत्समसूत्रगा मुखपटीशक्तिध्वजाद्युज्ज्वला
स्तूपीत्रय्युपशोभिता परिलसन्नासा च सङ्कीर्तिता ॥ ४० ॥

## पञ्जरजालकौ.

दण्डैर्द्वित्रिचतुर्मितैर्मितवितानातानकं पञ्जरं
नासाद्युज्ज्वलितं च जालकमथो वेद्यूर्ध्वतः संस्थितम् ।
दण्डैर्द्व्यादियुगान्तिमैस्ततमतो दण्डर्द्धितश्चायतं
कर्तव्यं द्विगुणान्तिमं सुषुरितं गोमूत्रकादिक्रमात् ॥ ४१ ॥

## THE WALL-ORNAMENTATIONS

38. All Prāsādas (temples) will have 'Aṅghris' (pillars), 'Toraṇas' (arches), and four 'Dvāras' (doors). Those which measure five cubits etc., may possess 'Pañjaras' with 'Jālas' between the ornate pillars. Those which are bigger (i.e., which possess larger measure) will have at the base four 'Kūṭas' at the four corners; and those which are still bigger, will have 'Śālās', 'Kūṭas' 'Nāsikās', attractive 'Jālas' and brilliant 'Pañjaras'.

## THE DIMENSION AND LOCATION OF ŚĀLĀS ETC.

39. When the length of the wall is divided by ten etc., (i.e., ten or eight), construct a 'Kūṭa' at (each of) the (four) corners, with one part thereof for its breadth and length; and a 'Sālā' on each of the four sides with two parts in length and one part in breadth; 'Nāsikā' between the 'Śālā' and the 'Kūṭa' with three-fourth of a part in measure and on either of its two sides make a 'Pañjara' with Jāla with three fourth of a part etc.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE KŪṬA AND ŚĀLĀ

40. That which has one-eighth of the measure of the temple and shape of the temple, which has parts of the temple from 'Prati' to the top of the 'Stūpi', which has 'Nāsikā' sprouting in the centre is called "Kūṭa". That which stands in the same line with the 'Kūṭa' which has grace imparted to it by 'Mukhapaṭṭi', 'Śakti', 'Dhvajas' and the like, which is ornamented by three 'Stūpis' and 'Nāsis' shining all around is known as "Śālā".

## PAÑJARA AND JĀLAKA

41. 'Pañjara' must be made with a measure of two, three or four Daṇḍas in its length and breadth and adorned with 'Nāsas' and the like: and a 'Jalaka' should be made and it should be situated above the 'Vedijālaka' which has breadth beginning with two and ending with four Daṇḍas, and length beginning with one Daṇḍa added on to the breadth and ending with twice the breadth, the increase being by one Daṇḍa; and which has perforation, the holes whereof are arranged in the order of Gomūtraka (a pattern resembling the course or line marked by the urination of a bull; reference is to an undulatory design).

## कुम्भलता.

स्तम्भान्तरे महति धामनि पादविस्तारोच्चाधिपादततपद्मगकुम्भसंस्थाम् ।
पादायतां घटमुखोद्गतपत्रचित्रमूलां प्रकल्पयतु कुम्भलतां समन्तात् ॥ ४२ ॥

## अल्पप्रासादे भूषणविशेषाः.

भङ्क्त्वा प्रत्युत्तरान्तर्गतचरणमितिं भोगिभिर्भागतोऽधो
वेदिं वेदैश्च पादान् दलरचितवलभ्युत्तरं भागतोऽथ ।
यावत्स्वोत्सेधनीप्रप्रसरवलभितः स्वार्हनीप्रं कपोतं
गेहेऽल्पे सप्तमेनोज्ज्वलपदगृहपिण्डिं करोत्वष्टमेन ॥ ४३ ॥

## उत्तरलक्षणम्.

खण्डोत्तरं चरणविस्तृतितुल्यविस्तारोत्सेधमुत्तममतश्चरणोनतीव्रम् ।
पत्रोत्तरं दलविहीनघनं कनिष्ठं रूपोत्तरं घनतती विपरीततो वा ॥ ४४ ॥

## रूपोत्तरे भूषणविन्यासः.

उत्सेधे विशिखांशिते द्वितयतो रूपोत्तरे वाजनं
षड्भक्तेऽल्पमिलांशतो द्वितयतो वा स्यान्महावाजनम् ।
एतन्निर्गमनं निजांशविहितं न्यस्येदुपर्युत्तर-
स्यैतत्तीव्रसमुच्छ्रयोच्छ्रयदलांशव्याततां पट्टिकाम् ॥ ४५ ॥

## फलकाप्रस्तरेणाच्छादनकरणम्.

एकाङ्घ्र्यूनादिदण्डोच्छ्रितमुपरि निधायोत्तरे वाजनं प्राक्
तिर्यग्दण्डोच्छ्रिताङ्घ्र्यूनितविततितुलास्तासु वंशानुवृत्त्या ।
स्वार्धाक्रान्ता जयन्तीस्तदुपरि सुसमीकृत्य कृत्वानुमार्गं
निश्छिद्रं छादयेत् स्वोचितघनफलकाप्रस्तरेणोर्ध्वभागम् ॥ ४६ ॥

## KUMBHALATĀ: POT-AND-CREEPER ORNAMENT

42. In a big structure construct "Kumbhalatā" between the pillars all around; its 'Kumbha' (pot-shaped part) should be made to rest in a 'Padma', the height of which is equal to the breadth of the pillar and breadth one and a quarter of the height; from the mouth of the pot whose base is decorated with leaf-motifs shall spring forth creeper (latā) to the extent of the length of the pillar.

## ORNAMENTAL FEATURES OF AN ALPA-PRĀSĀDA

43. In the case of an 'Alpageha' (small structure), the height of the pillar between (Prati) and (Uttara) being divided into eight parts, with one part thereof construct a 'Vedi' at the base; with four parts 'Pādas' (above it); with one part 'Valabhyuttara' half part going to Valabhi and half to the Uttara; then above Valabhi, which has projection equal to its own height, construct 'Kapota' with the seventh part giving it a suitable projection; and with the eighth part make a 'Gṛhapiṇḍi' having ornate pillars.

## THE CHARACTERISTICS OF 'UTTARA'.

44. The 'Khaṇḍottara' which has a breadth and a thickness equal to the breadth of the pillar is of the best type; 'Patrottara' which has a thickness less by one-fourth is of the middling type; that whose thickness is less by half is known as 'Rūpottara' and it is of the lowest type; the thickness and breadth may be optionally reversed in position.

## ORNAMENTATION OF RŪPOTTARA.

45. When the thickness of the "Rūpottara" is divided into five parts 'Vājana' will be made with two parts; or, when the same is divided by six, with one part will be made the 'Alpavājana' and with two parts the 'Mahāvājana'. The projection of these (Vājanas) will be to the extent of their own parts (ie. their own thickness). Then, above the 'Uttara' place a 'Paṭṭikā' whose 'ucchraya' (height) is as much as its (uttara's) thickness and breadth half this height (ucchraya).

## THE MAKING OF WOODEN CEILING

46. Having first placed the 'Vājana' of the height of one or three-fourth of a Daṇḍa etc., on the 'Uttara', and then above this 'Tulās' of one Daṇḍa height and three-fourth of Daṇḍa breadth cross-wise, above these in the direction of the 'Uttara,' place 'Jayantis', half cut (into the Tulās); then, having fixed up *anumārgas* (interstices) and made the above even, cover up closely the upper portion with spreading planks of suitable thickness.

## पक्षान्तरेण शिलादिभिराच्छादनकरणम्.

द्वारार्धतः कदलिकाकरणेन गर्भकुड्यं क्रमान्मुकुलयेदथवा शिलाद्यैः ।
द्वारोर्ध्वतोऽष्टपुटचारुलसत्तरङ्गगर्भार्धतुङ्गमपिधानशिलाभिरामम् ॥ ४७ ॥

## लुपाकरणं स्थापनं च.

कुर्यादुत्तरपट्टिकोपरि लुपाः कूटप्रविष्टाग्रकाः
स्वस्वांशाहितकर्णसूत्रकमिता मध्यादिकर्णावधि ।
स्तम्भोच्चे शरशैलनन्दनयनैर्भक्ते चतुर्धोत्तरात्
तासां स्यादवलम्बनं नयनवह्न्यब्ध्युर्वरांशैः क्रमात् ॥ ४८ ॥

## नीव्रफलका वलयश्च.

अष्टांशकादिकृशविस्तृतिपावकांशतोत्रा च नीव्रफलकोत्तरतो लुपानाम् ।
द्वित्राङ्गुलादिविततं चतुरश्ररूपं कर्तव्यमासु वलयं च निजानुरूपम् ॥ ४९ ॥

## लुपानामुपरिगता पिधानफलका स्तूबिका च.

शाकाद्युत्तमदारुक्लृप्तफलकैरेताः समन्ताल्लुपाः
सञ्छाद्योपरि तत्पिधानफलकां कृत्वोल्लसत्कीलकाम् ।
वास्त्वाधारसमोन्नतां प्रथिततत्पाथोजकुम्भादिकां
विन्यस्येन्नवपुण्डरीकमुकुलाग्रामूर्ध्वतः स्तूबिकाम् ॥ ५० ॥

## शिखरसंछादने वस्तुविशेषकथनम्.

वर्षातपादिवारणकल्यैः शुल्बादिकल्पितैः फलकैः ।
सारेष्टकादिभिर्वा विमानशिखरं ततः सुपिदधातु ॥ ५१ ॥

## CONSTRUCTION OF CEILING WITH STONE, ETC., AS AN ALTERNATIVE

47. From above half the height of the door, (starting) from the corners close up gradually the Garbhakuḍya with materials like the stone as an alternative, in the order of 'Kadalikākaraṇa'; above the door, then, to a height which is half of the Garbha, will be presented an octagonal beautiful wavy ornamentation and a covering slab (Pidhānaphalakā) charming to behold.

## THE MAKING AND DISPOSITION OF RAFTERS

48. Above the Uttarapaṭṭikā, place rafters with their extremity entered into the Kūṭa. From the centre to the limit of the corner, their length will measure the extent of their own Karṇasūtra (diagonal connecting the Kūṭa with the Uttara). The height of the column, having been divided into parts five, seven, nine or two, parts two, three, four or one part thereof, will in order constitute their 'Avalambana' (eaves, the overhanging portion below).

## THE NĪPRAPHALAKĀ AND THE VALAYA

49. The 'Nīpraphalakā' of rafters will have a breadth one-eighth etc., less than that of the 'Uttara' and a thickness one-third of its breadth. Square 'Valaya' two aṅgulas, three aṅgulas etc., of breadth as befits the rafters must be made (and run) through them.

## THE COVER OVER RAFTERS AND THE FINIAL

50. Having covered well the rafters all around in the above with planks made of the best timber like 'Śāka' (*Tectona grandis*) and having placed above this the 'Pidhānaphalakā' (the final phalakā which is the covering for the Kūṭa) with a shining kīla (nail) fixed over it, above it place the 'Stūpikā' (finial), which has a height equal to that of the basement, constituent elements such as the full-blown lotus (Padma), pot (kumbha) etc., and top in the form of a fresh lotus-bud (kuḍmala).

## REFERENCE TO THE MATERIALS FOR THE COVERING OF ŚIKHARA

51. Then close up well the 'Śikhara' of the 'Vimāna' with plates of metal such as copper or very strong bricks capable of resisting the inclemencies of weather like rain, heat (and snow).

## अल्पप्रासादे षडङ्गानि.

अल्पे धामनि विस्तृतिद्विगुणितप्रायोच्छ्रयेऽष्टांशिते
मूलांशेन मसूरकोच्छ्रयमथ स्तम्भोच्छ्रयं द्व्यंशतः ।
भूयः प्रस्तरमंशतो गलमिलांशेन प्रक्लसोच्छ्रयं
भागाभ्यां शिखरोच्छ्रयं विरचयेदेकांशतः स्तूबिकाम् ॥ ५२ ॥

## प्रस्तरविभागाः.

स्तम्भार्धादिसमुच्छ्रये प्रकृतिभक्ते प्रस्तरे वातिधृ-
त्यंशे चोत्तरवाजने त्रिशशिभिर्भूतालिरंशैस्त्रिभिः ।
क्ष्माद्रीन्दुक्षितिभिः सवाजनकपोतालिङ्गपट्टयन्तरी-
स्त्र्येकांशैः प्रतिवाजने प्रतिकपोते क्ष्मांशहान्यावरे ॥ ५३ ॥

## एकतलविधानसमाप्तिर्द्वितलविधानारम्भश्च.

इत्येकभूमौ चतुरश्ररूपे सुरालयेऽल्पे विधिरभ्यधायि ।
अथाभिधास्ये द्वितलादिजातिच्छन्दादिवृत्तादिगतं विशेषम् ॥ ५४ ॥

## प्रमाणवशात् तलसंख्याकथनम्.

त्र्याद्याशाकरपश्चिमं शशितलं बाणादिमार्ताण्डदोः-
पर्यन्तं द्वितलं हयादिनृपहस्तान्तं त्रिभूम्यन्वितम् ।
कुर्याद् धाम निजोचितोच्छ्रययुतं प्रोक्तोच्छ्रयेष्वेष्वतो
युक्त्या पाददलत्रिपादकरसंयोगक्षयौ च क्वचित् ॥ ५५ ॥

## द्वितलविधानम्.

आरूढभित्तिमुपचित्य लुपाग्रधानीं युक्त्या तलान्तरविधौ प्रविधाय तस्याम् ।
बाह्योत्तराहितलुपा विनिवेश्य कृत्वा तत्पट्टिकां च तलितेऽथ गलं विदध्यात् ॥ ५६ ॥

## THE SIX MAIN PARTS OF THE ALPAPRĀSĀDA

52. In the case of an Alpaprāsāda, its height which is double its breadth being divided into eight parts, give one part thereof at the bottom to the height of the '*Adhiṣṭhāna*' (basement), two parts above to the height of the '*Stambha*' (pillar), one part to '*Prastara*' (entablature), one part to the height of the '*Gala*' (neck), two parts to the height of the '*Śikhara*' (head) above it, and one part to the '*Stūpikā*' (finial).

## THE DIVISIONS OF THE PRASTARA

53. The Prastara which has height half etc., of that of the pillar, being divided into twenty-one parts or nineteen parts, make (in the former case) 'Uttara' with three parts thereof, and 'Vājana' with one part, 'Bhūtāli' with three parts, 'Vājana' with one part, 'Kapota' with seven parts, 'Āliṅga' with one part and 'Antarī' with one part, 'Prati' with three parts and its 'Vājana' with one part; in the second (alternative) division into nineteen parts, make 'Prati' and 'Kapota' each one part less.

## CONCLUSION OF EKATALAVIDHĀNA AND BEGINNING OF DVITALAVIDHĀNA

54. Thus has been laid down the prescription relating to the construction of a small temple, which has one 'tala' and square shape. Now shall I specially speak of temples coming under the class of two talas etc., Jāti, Chandas etc., and Vṛtta and the like.

## REFERENCE TO TALAS ON THE BASIS OF DIMENSION

55. The temple which has a measure beginning with three cubits and ending with ten cubits, will have one Tala; that which has a measure beginning with five and ending with twelve cubits will have two Talas; and that having a measure beginning with seven and ending with sixteen cubits will have three Talas: each will possess a height which is suitable to itself. In these various heights that have been referred to above there may be brought about, if desired, an addition or subtraction by one-fourth, half, three-fourth of one cubit.

## THE CONSTRUCTION OF DVITALA

56. When a second Tala is to be built, having raised the internal wall, and placed thereon a fitting plank capable of holding the ends of the rafters, upon it place the rafters that are fixed on the outer Uttara, and then, having placed Paṭṭikā over these, and levelled the floor make the 'Gala' (regular structural 'Gala-neck.').

## प्रतितलं ग्रीवाप्रमाणम्.

स्तम्भे प्राथमिकेऽनलादिशिवनिष्ठैरंशितेंऽशैः क्रमा-
न्नेत्राग्नित्रिगुणेषुशैलशरनागाङ्कोन्मितैः सम्मिता ।
ग्रीवोक्ता नवधा ततोऽपि तलक्लृप्तौ पूर्वपूर्वाङ्घ्रितः
प्रोन्नेया च तदुन्नतिः प्रतितलं स्यात् प्रस्तरप्रक्रिया ॥ ५७ ॥

## ग्रीवावयवविशेषाः.

ग्रीवायामुपरि त्रिदण्डपरिशिष्टांशे चतुर्भाजिते
मूलांशं च तृतीयकं च दशधा तुर्यं च कृत्वांशकम् ।
आलिङ्गाह्वयपट्टिकां त्रिभिरुभाभ्यामन्तरिं पञ्चभिः
स्वद्व्यंशाहितवाजनां प्रतिमधःपङ्क्त्यंशके कल्पयेत् ॥ ५८ ॥

शालाकूटगवाक्षकादिरुचिरां भित्तिं द्वितीये तृती-
येंऽशे पञ्चभिरुत्तरं च वलभिं भूतद्विपाद्युज्ज्वलाम् ।
तुर्येंऽशे दशभिर्द्विक्लृप्तमुखपट्टयाढ्यं कपोतं ततः
सस्वाङ्घ्रिं गृहपिण्डिमूर्ध्वनिहितैर्दण्डैस्त्रिभिः कल्पयेत् ॥ ५९ ॥

## द्वितीये तले भूषणविशेषाः.

तले द्वितीये विदिशासु कूटान् दिशासु शालाश्च तदन्तरेषु ।
नासीर्द्विशो वा रचयेद् दिशासु मूर्तीरजाद्याः शिखरे च नासीः ॥ ६० ॥

## तृतीये तले कल्पनीये, मध्यमशिखरकरणम्.

बाह्योत्तरेण रहिते विगतोर्ध्वकूटे ग्रीवान्तरे निजगजांशकुशाग्रकुड्ये ।
न्यस्योत्तरं न्यसतु तत्र लुपास्तुलास्थपादेषु लग्नशिरसश्चरणार्धलम्बाः ॥ ६१ ॥

## THE DIMENTION OF GRĪVĀ CORRESPONDING TO EACH (UPPER) TALA

57. The height of the first pillar, having been divided by any number beginning with three and ending with eleven, with parts two, three, three, three, five, seven, five, eight and nine in order thereof, are composed the nine alternative types of 'Grīvā'; in each Tala higher up, must be maintained its height proportionate to the height of the pillar preceding it (i.e., beneath it); in each will be made the 'Prastara.'

## MOULDINGS AND OTHER ORNAMENTATIONS OF GRĪVĀ—(TALA)

58. In the 'Grīvā', having left three Daṇḍas at the top, divide the remainder into Four Divisions; the First (i.e., the bottom-most), the Third and the Fourth being each divided by ten, in the lower (i.e. the First) division into ten parts, with three parts thereof construct the 'Paṭṭikā' known as 'Āliṅga,' with two parts 'Antarī' and with five parts 'Prati' with Vājana, 'Vājana' whereof has two parts.

59. In the Second Division make a 'Bhitti' (wall) beautified with Śālās, Kūṭas, Gavākṣas and the like; in the Third Division into ten parts, construct an 'Uttara' with five parts and 'Valabhi' (with the remaining five) decorated with figures of Bhūtas (spirits), Dvipas (elephants), and the like; in the Fourth Division into ten parts, make 'Kapota' accompanied by a 'Mukhapaṭṭikā' which is of two parts thereof; then, with the three Daṇḍas that have been left at the top, construct a 'Gṛhapiṇḍi' together with its own 'Aṅghris' (legs *i.e.*, pillars).

## SPECIAL ADORNMENTS OF THE SECOND TALA

60. In the second Tala, construct at the corners 'Kūṭas', and on the sides 'Śālās;' between them (i.e., the Śālās and the Kūṭas) make two Nāsis and again, as an optional addition, the images of Brahmā etc., in the quarters; and in the Śikhara construct 'Nāsis'.

## THE MAKING OF THE INTERMEDIATE ROOF WHEN A THIRD TALA IS TO BE BUILT

61. In the succeeding Grīvā (above) which is devoid of the 'Bāhyottara' and the 'Ūrdhvakūṭa,' place an 'Uttara' on its wall, whose top is less than the base in breadth by one-eighth, and then fix there rafters, whose lower extremity is fixed on posts (i.e. supports) standing on the Tulās and whose eaves measure half the height of the pillar.

## जातिप्रासादाः.

प्रासादास्त्रितलादिभानुतलनिष्ठा जातयः स्थाणुसू-
यीद्यैरोजसमैः करैः परिमिताश्चासप्ततेर्वर्धितैः ।
षोढा वह्नितलादयो ह्यधममध्यश्रेष्ठक्लृप्त्या पृथग्
व्यासाद्र्यंशगुणांशकाधिकसमुत्सेधाश्च ते प्रायशः ॥ ६२ ॥

## छन्दः, विकल्पः, आभासश्च.

विश्वेन्द्राद्येषुषट्षष्ट्यसमसमकरैरब्धिभौमादयः स्यु-
श्छन्दा हस्तैर्नवाशादिभिरिषुरसपञ्चाशदन्तैर्विकल्पाः ।
पञ्चक्ष्माद्याश्च सर्वे प्रतितलमृतुभिन्ना विवस्वत्तलान्ता
रुद्राद्येकोनतानावधिभिरुदधिभूम्याद्यथाभाससंज्ञाः ॥ ६३ ॥

## प्रतिवर्गं प्रासादभेदाः.

आभासेऽत्र चतुस्तलादिशिवभूम्यन्तं पृथग् वेदभे-
दाढ्यं द्वादशमन्तिमं द्व्यधममध्यादिक्रमात् षड्भिदम् ।
षष्टिर्जातिगृहे भिदाः करवशाच्छन्दे षड्नास्ततः
षट्कोनाश्च विकल्पधामनि तथाभासे दशोनास्ततः ॥ ६४ ॥

## वृत्तप्रासादः.

स्वाभीष्टमाने दशयुक्तसप्तशतांशिते विश्वलसच्छतांशः ।
यस्तेन मानेन परिभ्रमय्य वृत्तात्मकं वेश्म समातनोतु ॥ ६५ ॥

## चतुरश्रदीर्घप्रासादः.

नाहार्धमानप्रचये हरिद्भिर्भक्तेऽर्णवांशैर्विततिं तनोतु ।
आयाममंशैर्ऋतुसंमितैश्च तुर्यश्रदीर्घस्य सुरालयस्य ॥ ६६ ॥

## JĀTI PRĀSĀDAS

62. Prāsādas which have talas beginning with three and ending with twelve are (called) '*Jātis*'; they have measure beginning with the odd and even number of eleven and twelve cubits and increased up to seventy (cubits); these, having three talas and the rest, are each of sixty kinds, both the odd and even measure type admitting of the classification into varieties, Adhama (lowest), Madhyama (middling) and Śreṣṭha (best). They generally have a height which is more than the breadth by three-seventh of breadth.

## CHANDAS, VIKALPA AND ĀBHĀSA

63. Beginning with the odd and even measures of thirteen and fourteen and ending with sixty-five and sixty-six cubits respectively, the temples of four talas etc., form the '*Chanda-Prāsādas*'; beginning with (the odd and even measures of) nine and ten cubits and ending with fifty-five and fifty-six, Prāsādas with five talas etc. constitute the '*Vikalpa*' class. All these, ending with twelve talas, in each instance of tala admit of a classification into six different kinds. Now, those which have odd and even measures beginning with eleven and twelve and ending with forty-seven and forty-eight cubits, and which have four talas etc., are known as '*Ābhāsa*.'

## DIFFERENT PRĀSĀDAS UNDER EACH CLASS

64. Here, in the '*Ābhāsa*' class which has talas beginning with four and ending with eleven, each case will have four varieties; the last case, which has twelve talas, will have six varieties by reason of the order of 'Adhama,' 'Madhyama' and 'Uttama' for both (odd and even types of its measure). Thus from the point of view of (the different types of) cubit measures, in the '*Jāti Prāsāda*' there are sixty different kinds, in the 'Chandas' six less (i.e. forty-four), in the '*Vikalpa*' six more less (*i.e.*, forty-eight) and in the '*Ābhāsa*' still ten less (*i.e.*, thirty-eight).

## VṚTTA PRĀSĀDA—CIRCULAR STRUCTURE

65. When the desired perimeter is divided by seven hundred and ten, describe a circle with a radius of one hundred and thirteen parts thereof and then build a circular temple.

## CATURAŚRADĪRGHA—RECTANGULAR STRUCTURE

66. When half the perimeter is divided by ten, give four parts thereof for the breadth and six parts for the length of the temple.

## हस्तिपृष्ठप्रासादः.

स्वाभीष्टे परिणाहमाननिचये धाम्नश्चतुःषष्टिभा-
गोनेऽष्टादशधा कृतेऽर्णवमितैरंशैः पृथक् कल्पयेत् ।
पार्श्वद्वन्द्वसमायती मुखततिं च द्व्यंशसूत्रभ्रमात्
प्रायः साङ्घ्रिरसांशनाहमपि पृष्ठं हस्तिपृष्ठात्मनः ॥ ६७ ॥

## वृत्तायतप्रासादः.

भागद्वये द्विरदपृष्ठसमुक्तनीत्या वृत्तीकृते तदुभयान्तरभागदैर्घ्यम् ।
स्वेधांशतो विरहितेन गुणांशकेन वृत्तायते वितनुयात सुरवर्यधिष्ण्ये ॥ ६८ ॥

## षट्कोणप्रासादः.

षोढा विभज्य निजवाञ्छितमानराशिमंशायतानि परिकल्प्य षडश्रकाणि ।
कुर्याद् गृहं रसपुटं द्विगुणांशमानो व्यासोंऽशितेऽत्र तिथिभिर्नयनांशहीनः ॥ ६९ ॥

## अष्टाश्रप्रासादः.

स्वाभीष्टनाहे दशधा विभक्ते व्यासस्त्रिभागैर्द्विषडंशितेऽस्मिन् ।
व्यासे शरांशैर्विहितायतांस्तदश्रींश्च कुर्याद् वसुकोणधाम्नः ॥ ७० ॥

## त्रयो मुख्यप्रकाराः नागरद्राविडवेसराः.

मूलाद्याशिखरं युगाश्ररचितं गेहं स्मृतं नागरं
ग्रीवाद्याशिखरक्रियं षडुरगाश्रोद्भेदितं द्राविडम् ।
मूलाद्वा गलतोऽथवा परिलसद्वृत्तात्मकं वेसरं
तेष्वेकं पृथगात्तलक्ष्मसु विदध्यादात्मनः सम्मतम् ॥ ७१ ॥

## HASTIPṚṢṬHA—APSIDAL STRUCTURE

67. The desired perimeter of the temple called 'Hastipṛṣṭha' being divided into sixty-four parts, deduct one part therefrom and then having divided the remainder (sixty-three parts) thereof into eighteen parts, with four parts thereof in each case make the two sides (pārśvas) of equal length, and the breadth of the front; then with two parts as the radius, draw a semi-circle, the measure of which will nearly (i.e. roughly) amount to parts six and one-fourth.

## VṚTTĀYATA—ELLIPSOIDAL STRUCTURE

68. In a Vṛttāyata class of temple draw on two sides two semi-circles with radius described in the Hastipṛṣṭha type; deduct from the division (into 18 parts) three parts and divide the remaining parts into twenty-one parts; with twenty parts thereof determine the length between the two semi-circles.

## ṢAṬKOṆA PRĀSĀDA—HEXAGONAL STRUCTURE

69. The desired perimeter of the Prāsāda, being divided into six parts, assigning one part thereof for the length of each of the six sides make an hexagonal structure. Here, having divided two parts thereof by fifteen, and deducted two parts therefrom, the remainder (i.e. 13 parts) will form the breadth of the structure.

## AṢṬĀŚRA PRĀSĀDA—OCTAGONAL STRUCTURE

70. The desired perimeter of an octagonal structure being divided into ten parts, three parts thereof will constitute the Vyāsa of the structure. Having divided this Vyāsa into twelve parts, five parts thereof will form the length of each side.

## THE THREE MAIN STYLES—NĀGARA, DRĀVIḌA AND VESARA

71. That temple is known as '*Nāgara*' which is made square from the 'mūla' (basement) to the 'Śikhara' (head) (both inclusive); that is '*Drāviḍa*' which is made distinctly hexagonal or octagonal from above 'Grīvā' (neck) to the end of 'Śikhara' (head); that is '*Vesara*' which exhibits circular shape either from the basement or the 'Gala': any one from among these whose features have been particularly prescribed, may be constructed according to one's liking.

## मुखमण्डपप्रमाणम्.

नेत्रेषुसप्तदशभानुभिरादिधाम्नस्तारं विभज्य विधुलोकयुगाङ्गभूतैः ।
विस्तारमत्र रचयेन्मुखमण्डपस्य पादोनमर्धमथवा सममस्य दैर्घ्यम् ॥ ७२ ॥

## पञ्चप्राकाराणां विभागः.

दण्डेऽर्धेऽन्तर्गतं मण्डलमवनिमितेऽर्धान्विते वान्तहारा
दोःसङ्ख्ये मध्यहारा जलधिपरिमिते बाह्यहाराद्रिसङ्ख्ये ।
मर्यादा मूलधाम्नः प्रथमचरमवर्जं मुखायामयुक्ताः
प्राकाराः पञ्च कार्याः स्युरिह चरमसीमैकविंशेऽपि वा स्यात् ॥ ७३ ॥

## दण्डमुखायामलक्षणम्

प्रासादस्योत्तरसमववेर्जागतान्तस्य वा स्याद्
व्यासो दण्डस्त्रिविध उदितः पादुकोन्तस्य वात्र ।
नेयश्चायं निजनिजपदात् सैकदण्डः सपादः
सार्धः साङ्घ्रित्रय इति मुखायाममानं समुक्तम् ॥ ७४ ॥

## प्राकारान् प्रति दण्डावधिः.

भक्तायामग्रभूमाविषुभिरिह बहिर्द्व्यंशकं त्र्यंशमन्तः
कृत्वान्तर्मण्डले दिक्परिवृढबलिपीठेषु तद्दण्डसीमा ।
प्राच्यावाच्याः स्वसूत्रेष्वितरदिगधिपाश्चालिताः किञ्चनातः
प्रादक्षिण्यान्मिथस्ते द्वितय इह महादिङ्मुखाः सम्मुखाश्च ॥ ७५ ॥

## अर्चनामण्डपविधानम्.

अन्तर्मण्डलतो व्यतीत्य करमात्रं प्रार्चनामण्डपं
तुर्यश्रं समसूरकं निजमुखायामस्य वा मध्यतः ।
वेदस्तम्भभृतैकभारमथवा कुर्याच्चतुर्द्वादश-
स्तम्भद्व्युत्तरसंयुतं समकुटाद्यालङ्क्रियालङ्कृतम् ॥ ७६ ॥

## THE DIMENSION OF THE MUKHAMAṆḌAPA—FRONT-PORCH

72. Having divided the breadth of the main shrine by two, five, seven, ten and twelve, with one part, three, four, six and five parts in order, assign the breadth of 'Mukhamaṇḍapa'; its length will be half or three-fourth of or equal to the breadth (of the temple).

## THE DISPOSITION OF PAÑCAPRĀKĀRAS

73. Half a Daṇḍa moved from the main shrine is to be the surrounding inner enclosure ('Antarmaṇḍala'); one Daṇḍa or one and a half Daṇḍas away, the '*Antahārā*'; two Daṇḍas away, the '*Madhyahārā*'; four Daṇḍas away the '*Bāhyahārā*'; and seven Daṇḍas off the '*Maryādā*'. Excepting the first and the last (enclosures) all will have a Mukhāyāma (Facade). Here the last enclosure may be alternatively twenty-one Daṇḍas away.

## DESCRIPTION OF DAṆḌA AND MUKHĀYĀMA

74. Here, 'Daṇḍa,' is of three kinds: it may be the measure which is equal to the extent of the Uttara of the Prāsāda (*i.e.*, the breadth between the uttaras) or to that of the Jagatī or to that of the Pāduka; this unit of Daṇḍa in each case, must be started from its own place. The measure of the '*Mukhāyāma*' is said to be one 'Daṇḍa,' one and one-fourth, one and a half or one and three-fourth of a Daṇḍa.

## THE DAṆḌA LIMIT WITH REFERENCE TO PRĀKĀRAS (THE LOCATION OF BALIPĪṬHA)

75. When in the Antarmaṇḍala the top of the Balipīṭha in the quarters is divided by five, the outer extremity of the 'Daṇḍa' will be situated on the line which keeps two parts thereof outside, and three parts inside. The lords of the east and the south will lie in their 'sūtras', while the others are deviated a little from their sūtra in the right-hand circumambulatory direction. Both these will face the principal quarters and one another.

## THE DISPOSITION OF ARCANĀMAṆḌAPA

76. Moved one cubit from the limit of the Antarmaṇḍala with a cubit's distance therefrom or in the centre of its Mukhāyāma, make a 'Prārcanāmaṇḍapa' which is square, which has a basement, one 'uttara' borne by four pillars or two uttaras supported by four and twelve (i.e. sixteen) pillars and which is decorated with ornamentations such as the finial.

## अन्तहारादिषु दण्डावसाननियमः.

दण्डं स्वं समतीत्य भित्तिरुदिता बाह्यान्तहाराश्रिता
दण्डान्तो द्विविधस्तदुत्तरविभिन्नोऽग्रे सभाभेदतः ।
ज्वालासीमनि दीपधामनि तथान्तस्थोत्तरेऽन्तर्गते
प्राकारेऽथ बहिष्ठितोत्तरबहिःसाले महीयस्यपि ॥ ७७ ॥

## अन्तहाराक्लृप्तिः.

पृष्ठे सपार्श्वद्वितये स्वमूलयोन्यन्वितं मण्डपमाकलय्य ।
तुर्यश्रमातत्य ततोऽन्तराले तन्वीत संयोज्य मिथोऽन्तहाराम् ॥ ७८ ॥

## अग्रे सभाविधानम्.

कृत्वा वंशं मुखायत्युपचितनिजदण्डस्थितं पार्श्वहारा-
भारासक्ताग्रमूलं प्रथितगुणविभागादिक्लृप्त्या विभज्य ।
कृत्वा तद्भागतस्तद्वितितिमुचितयोन्याढ्यमन्योत्तराणि
न्यस्यारूढोत्तरादीन्यपि रचयतु तद्युक्तितोऽग्रे सभायाम् ॥ ७९ ॥

## पादसूत्रसभाविशेषः.

स्वाभीष्टे सममर्धिते गृहपरीणाहे स्ववंशप्रथा-
द्वन्द्वोने चतुरादियुग्मपरिसङ्ख्याभिर्विभक्ते समम् ।
एकांशेन ततिं तनोतु परिशिष्टैराततिं चांशकै-
रूनांशं परितः प्रपूरयतु चैवं पादसूत्रे क्रमः ॥ ८० ॥

## बलिपीठिकास्थानम्.

प्रासादमध्याद् बहिरग्रतो गते तदुत्तरोत्थे सदलद्विसङ्ख्यके ।
दण्डे त्रिसार्धत्रिशराङ्गसप्तके स्वधाम्नि कुर्याद् बलिपीठिकां तथा ॥ ८१ ॥

## THE OUTER LIMIT OF ANTAHĀRĀ ETC.

77. The outer wall relating to the 'Antahārā,' it is stated, should be beyond its own Daṇḍa extremity; in the front, on account of the division of 'Sabhā' based on its difference in 'uttara' the "Daṇḍa" extremity is said to be of two kinds. In the case of 'Dīpadhāman' (light-house which is in the Madhyahārā) it (i.e., Daṇḍa extremity) will be in the extremity of the flame. In the inner Prākāra (inner to the Maryādā, *i.e.*, the Bāhyahārā) it will be in the internal uttara; in the case of the big Śālā (i.e. the Mahāmaryādā) it is at the extremity of the external uttara.

## THE MAKING OF ANTAHĀRĀ

78. On the two sides and at the back, giving each a Yoni proper for its quarter, construct square 'Maṇḍapas' and extending them and linking the interspaces between each other, build the 'Antahārā.'

## THE MAKING OF THE SABHĀ IN FRONT

79. Along the Daṇḍa limit of the Antahārā with its Mukhāyāma, fix up an uttara in the front Sabhā, whose mūla and agra (both extremities) are entered in the Bhāra (i.e. the uttara) of the Pārśvahārā; then, assigning it a proper yoni and giving it a breadth according to the well-known rule of 'Guṇavibhāga' and the like, place Ārūḍha (internal) and other uttaras, as befits the structure.

## PĀDASŪTRA TYPE OF SABHĀ

80. When the desired perimeter of the temple is divided into two equal halves, deduct therefrom two times the breadth of its uttara, and then divide the remainder equally by any one of the even numbers beginning with four; one part thereof will be given to the breadth, the remaining parts to the length; and add to this all around, the portion deducted (namely twice the vistāra of the uttara): this is the order employed in the 'Pādasūtra.'

## SITUATION OF BALAPĪṬHIKĀ

81. Then outside in front, moved from the centre of the Prāsāda to a distance which may be two and a half, or three or three and a half or five or six or seven Uttara-Daṇḍas away, construct the 'Balipīṭhikā' (which should be set up) in its own house.

## बलिपीठिकाक्लृप्तिः.

पूजापीठसमं षडंशरहितं गर्भप्रतिप्रोन्मितं
प्रासादप्रतिसम्मितं च बलिपीठेऽब्जान्तिमाभ्युच्छ्रयम् ।
उत्सेधे दशधांशिते सति निजेष्टे पीठिकाविस्तृतिं
सप्तांशैर्विदधीत मूलनिलयौचित्यात् तदङ्गक्रियाम् ॥ ८२ ॥

## बलिपीठिकावयवविशेषाः.

पृथ्व्या पादुकमंशतो जगतिकां वेदैर्गुणैः कैरवं
तत्पट्टीगलकम्बुनिद्रवमपि क्ष्मापङ्क्तिभूमीन्दुभिः ।
कुर्वीत ज्वलनैः कपोतमिलयाग्रे पट्टिकां पङ्कजं
नेत्राभ्यामपि सप्तविंशतिविभक्ते पीठिकाभ्युच्छ्रये ॥ ८३ ॥

## पक्षान्तरेण बलिपीठिकाविधानम्.

पीठोच्चे रदभेदिते सदलभूसार्धेषुबाणेन्दुभू-
दस्राः पादुकजागते कुमुदतत्पट्टयन्तरीषु प्रतौ ।
अंशा वेदयुगानि वेदिगलयोः सार्धौ वलभ्युत्तरे
दस्रौ चेति कपोतके शशिकराः स्युः पट्टिकापद्मयोः ॥ ८४ ॥

## THE DIMENSION OF THE BALIPĪṬHIKĀ

82. To the Balipīṭha give a height till the end of its Padma, which may be equal to that of the Pūjāpīṭha (the pedestal of the image), or one-sixth less than that, or as much as the height of the Garbha till its Prati (i.e. the height of the basement of the Garbhagṛha) or the height of the Prāsāda till its Prati (i.e., the basement of the Prāsāda). The height chosen being divided by ten, give seven parts thereof to the vistāra of the Pīṭhikā and make its various parts (mouldings) consistent with (i.e. on the model of those of) the principal structure.

## THE MOULDINGS OF THE BALIPĪṬHIKĀ

83. The height of the Balipīṭha being divided into twenty-seven parts, make 'Pāduka' with one part thereof; 'Jagatī' with four parts; 'Kumuda', with three; its 'Paṭṭikā' 'Kaṇṭha', 'Kambu' and 'Nidrava' with one part, ten parts, one part and one part respectively; 'Kapota', with three parts; upper 'Paṭṭikā', with one part; and 'Padma' with two parts.

## AN ALTERNATIVE PRESCRIPTION OF BALIPĪṬHIKĀ

84. The height of the Balipīṭha, being divided into thirty-two parts, give the 'Pāduka' and 'Jagatī' one and a half and five and a half parts respectively; 'Kumuda', its 'Paṭṭikā,' 'Antarī' and 'Prati' five parts, one part, one part and two parts respectively; 'Vedi' and 'Gala' four parts each; 'Valabhyuttara' one part and a half; 'Kapota' two and a half parts; 'Paṭṭikā' and 'Padma' one part and two parts respectively.

## PART III

## PART I (STANZAS 1—30) : PRELIMINARY TOPICS IN THE SCIENCE OF TEMPLE ARCHITECTURE

### STANZA 1

*" Prayer to the Supreme in the Saguṇa Aspect."*

Following the usual orthodox practice of Sanskrit writers, Nārāyaṇa, the author of Tantrasamuccaya commences his work with a prayer to the Supreme deity. The time-honoured practice of 'Maṅgala' as a preface to any performance, it is believed, would bring the work begun to a successful 'finis'. So the author begins the treatise with a prayer. The first letter 'Śrī' in the opening stanza is employed to strike the note of auspiciousness.

The various epithets employed in this stanza with reference to God sum up the Hindu idea of God. In the system of Hindu worship two phases are recognised; one dealing with attributes, and the other the negation of attributes. The former is known as 'Saguṇōpāsana' and the latter 'Nirguṇōpāsana'. *Nirguṇōpāsana* treats of an Impersonal Reality, unconditioned by attributes and ungoverned by relations. It is only mystics, who have attained to the highest state of grace, who have gone beyond mind, body and all the limits of worldly nature—it is only such super-beings—who are capable of comprehending such an uncoloured reality. But an ordinary man who is prone to concretise, who is inclined to conceive God in vivid form, worships a God of attributes. Hinduism offers us in the system of worship which admits of the two phases of *Saguṇa* and *Nirguṇa* a scale of interpretations of the conceptions of God, ranging from the most impersonal to the intensely personal. " The difference between the Supreme as Absolute Spirit and the Supreme as personal God is one of standpoint, and not of essence."[1]

*Jñāna* (Omniscience), *Santoṣa* (joy), *Nityatva* (eternity), *Svātantrya* (freedom), *Avighna* (negation of obstacles), *Vaibhava* (might) are the six excellences which are attributed to God. They are enumerated in the scriptural stanza in the *Viṣṇusaṁhitā*[2] :—

1. *Heart of Hindustan*, p. 64.
2. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*, Paṭala V, stanza 31 (T. S. S. Edition).

ज्ञानसन्तोषनित्यत्वस्वातन्त्र्याविघ्नवैभवैः ।
हृदयादिगुणैर्युक्तः सकलोऽनुग्रहादिकृत् ॥

These attributes which spring from thought, emotion and action are not isolated qualities but inter-connected excellences which lead to perfection. "Mere knowledge unvivified by the warmth of feeling, leads to icy coldness of heart; mere emotion, unlit by knowledge, is hysteria; mere action, unguided by wisdom and uninspired by love, is meaningless ritual and feverish unrest. All the three enter into the integral expression of a perfect life."[3] Hence God, when conceived as a personal being, is said to possess all the attributes which constitute the endowment of a perfect and absolute being. The form that God assumes for the sake of his devotees is a shining and resplendent one and one endowed with the attributes described above.

God is the Infinite Spirit immanent in the universe and He is both in us and out of us. "If God were not in us, there would be no sense of need; if God were out of us, there would be no sense of worship."[4] Religion is the realisation of God, and the paths to realisation are various in view of the fact of divergence in the taste and temperament of men. A few who are gifted with rare intuitive insight claim immediate experience and therefore do not require any means for the realisation of God. But the common man in the world of men, in whom the tendency to worship is ingrained, does not find it possible to think of a God as devoid of form or name. Attention to God in the abstract state is 'exceeding hard' for him without a concrete medium and mode of worship. "The use of means is an inevitable concession to the nature of mortal beings,"[5] and the 'means' served in the image. The religious devotee, when overwhelmed by spiritual devotion, seeks union with the deity through the service of an image that represents the deity in a chosen form. The supreme God, Formless and Absolute, is therefore said to assume form for the benefit of His aspirants. Thus the *Viṣṇusaṁhitā*[6] observes:—

भक्त्यैव परया तुष्टो देवदेवः स योगिनाम् ।
पूजाद्यनुग्रहायादौ रूपं भेजे चतुर्भुजम् ॥ ५० ॥

3. *Heart of Hindustan*, p. 10.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
5. Ānanda K. Coomāraswamy, *Catalogue of the Indian Collection in the Museum of Fine Arts* (Boston), Part II (Sculpture), p. 29.
6. *Viṣṇusaṁhitā*, Paṭala IV, stanzas 50, 49, 51[2] and 52[1].

कार्यार्था मूर्तयस्तस्य लोकानुग्रहहेतवः ।
अतः साकारमिष्टेमं भक्त्याप्याः सर्वसिद्धयः ॥ ४९ ॥
आकारेऽस्मिन् कृता पूजा स्तुतिर्वा ध्यानमेव वा ।
विधिना शास्त्रदृष्टेन देव एव कृता भवेत् ॥

Supreme reality, according to devotional theism is envisaged in a personal God, who assumes a form appropriate to the call of devotion and who becomes to his devotees the guide, master as well as the protector.

God is ever having his being in the highest plane of bliss, yet he feels joy at the offerings of His devotees. These offerings might appear trivial from the point of view of absolute values, but since they are sanctified by the exalted devotion and faith of the worshipper and since they embody the heart and represent the elements which are the cause of the very being of the devotee, they extract response and sympathy from the heart of the personal God worshipped.

In devotional theism, worship is characterised by a personal devotion, and its mode involves offerings in the form of *Gandha* (fragrant substance), *Puṣpa* (flower), *Dhūpa* (incense), *Dīpa* (light) and *Nivedya* (food). These things according to an ancient system of philosophy are associated with the elements or substances known as *Pṛthivī* (Earth), *Ākāśa* (Ether), *Vāyu* (air), *Tejaḥ* (light), and *jala* (water), which constitute the cause of the worshipper's body. Śaṅkara,[7] the commentator thus remarks:

"तत्र पृथिव्येव गन्धः, आकाश एव पुष्पं, वायुरेव धूपः, तेज एव दीपः, अप एव जलं निवेद्यं च। इति विभागः।"

In the qualifying expression स्वारम्भभूतात्मकैः which means the offerings which are the cause of the worshipper's being, the author advances the idea that by offering the various things such as *Gandha* etc., what is offered is the worshipper's body, which is composed of the elements identified with the things offered.

The real end of worship being realisation of God, an image forms only a *means* of approach to God. A text of the worshipper lays down: "*dēvo bhūtvā dēvam yajeta.*" This direction implies *identification* as an essential condition of worship in spirit and in truth. An image forms the stage in the process of one's identification with the deity worshipped.

7. *Tantrasamuccaya* with the commentary *Vimarśinī*, Vol. I, p. 2, (T. S. S. Edition).

Realisation of oneness with God which is the aim of *Pūjā*, is a significant idea and it is embedded in the word '*Samārādhana.*' It is explained by Śankara[8] thus:

समाराधनं समीचीना पूजा। पूजायाः सम्यत्त्वं नामात्मद्रव्यदेवतानामैक्यम्।

The last quarter of the stanza answers the query: how do we know the existence of God? Religion, as we know, is vision, intuitive spiritual experience, which is not a common experience. Ordinary man who is not spiritual at first hand also aspires to enjoy the consolations of religion. Such a man, who may be described as 'religious at second hand', is directed to refer to sacred writings, recourse to which reveals the knowledge about God. '*Nigamas*' (Vedas, Upaniṣads, etc.), '*Āgamas*' (Kāmikāgama, Viṣṇusaṁhitā etc.), '*Purāṇas*' and other sacred texts record truths about the existence of God. Vedic Ṛṣis who led a continuous and unselfish life possessed unique intuitive power and they visualised the Spirit eternal. They were 'the first researches in the realm of spirit', and the truths they announced have their root in the intuitive vision of spirit and spiritual experience of a permanent character. The statement '*Sadā paśyanti sūrayah*' tells us that the seer's vision is permanent, eternal. Purāṇas and Āgamas contain myths and rituals, and the description of God that is furnished therein tends towards an imagery that gives clothing to religious visions, for it is imagery that appeals to popular imagination. Through the path of ritual and imagery the Āgamas and Purāṇas guide men to the goal of God-realisation. The popular belief in the existence of God is established on the foundation of scriptural authority. The religious texts which embody the results of the investigations of seers in the divine science, it is believed, are handed down for the benefit of mankind, and their authority is hence looked upon as supreme and not to be questioned.

At the beginning of a book in Sanskrit, it is customary to indicate the four elements which are known as *Anubandhas.* They are (1) *Viṣaya* (subject-matter), (2) *Prayōjana* (purpose), (3) *Adhikārin* (the person entitled), and (4) *Sambandha* (connection). The *viṣaya* (subject-matter) which is here '*dēvārādhanapratipādana*' is indicated by the word '*Samārādhnuyām.*' The subjects dealt with in this treatise are those connected with image-worship such as the making of icons and temples to house the icons, the rituals bearing on daily worship, festivals and other divine matters which are treated in ancient Tāntrik literature. The word 'ANUGṚHṆĀTI' indicates the *prayōjana* which is '*devānugraha*' (God's blessing). The '*adhikārin*' or person eligible

8. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

for the use of the work is the worshipper as the word 'YAJVANAḤ' suggests. The connection of this text '*Tantrasamuccaya*' with the subject treated therein which is *Tantra* is the *sambandha.*

## STANZA 2

*"Homage to Divākara and character of the work 'Tantrasamuccaya.'"*

After *Maṅgalācaraṇa,* the author proceeds in this verse to pay his respectful homage to his preceptor, Divākara by name. The phrase 'Gurudivākara' indicates the preceptor's name. It is fitting that the author should start his work with due acknowledgment to the source he resorted to. He has collected information for his production from original Tāntrik literature which is vast like the sea. For, says he in the concluding stanza of his work :

"सोऽयं तन्त्रमिदं व्यधाद् बहुविधादुद्धृत्य तन्त्रार्णवात् ॥"

Tantras are a class of works which treat of a host of subjects such as *Sarga* (creation), *Pratisarga* (destruction), *Devatārādhana* (worship of God as personal being), *Ṣaṭkarmasādhana* (attainment of the six objects or super-human faculties), '*Caturvidhadhyānayoga* (four modes of union with the Supreme Spirit of Meditation) and other kindred subjects. To obtain a detailed idea of the extent of the subjects dealt with in an original and typical Tantra work, vide lines quoted in the *Śabdakalpadruma* beginning with 'सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च'.

According to tradition, Tantra is 'Śivōktaśāstra' and is treated mostly in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvati. Tantra is otherwise called Āgama and the '*Śabdakalpadruma*' calls Āgama a Tantraśāstra. The following interesting stanza tells us how Tantra came to be called Āgama :

आगतं पञ्चवक्त्रात्तु गतञ्च गिरिजानने । मतञ्च वासुदेवस्य तस्मादागममुच्यते ॥

The *Mahāsiddhāntasārasvata*[9] mentions sixty-four works on Tantra, but in the present state of our knowledge the list given therein is open to suspicion. Tantras are, however, very extensive in their treatment and are encyclopaedic in character. The work we are concerned with *viz.* the *Tantrasamuccaya,* as the title itself suggests, is a collection of subjects connected with worship of deities in temples, which are elaborately treated in the original Tāntrik literature. It deals with everything bearing on the construction and consecration of temples and images.

9. *Śabdakalpadruma* under the term 'Tantra.'

Thus it contains rules for the making of temples and images, rituals of consecration, daily worship, festivals and other allied matters connected with temple worship. Setting apart the ritualistic portion, with which we have no immediate concern, we shall find in the *Tantrasamuccaya* the codified knowledge of temple architecture whose fundamentals are found firmly rooted in the ancient Tāntrik works. This text, which is seen accepted as the highest authority on temple matters in Kerala warrants the view that the architecture of Kerala is a lineal descendent of the ancient Indian traditional architecture as set forth in ancient traditional treatises 'The Tantras'.

The line 'गुरुदिवाकरभद्रकटाक्षरुक्स्फुरितहृत्कमलोदरसंभृतम्' is significant. Śankara, in his *Vimarśinī* tells us that Divākara is the name of the author's preceptor. The 'Guru' is compared to the sun, and his kind looks to the sun's rays. The author's heart is compared to the lotus; just as the lotus is opened by the rays of the sun, so is the heart of the writer in which is collected the *Tantrasamuccaya* opened by the kind looks of the preceptor. The author pays glorious tributes to his preceptor by attributing him the excellence of splendour which is the attribute of the sun. The second comparison of heart with the lotus reveals the pleasant and compact nature of his work, which is a beautiful collection of Tāntrik subjects set in concise writing for the sake of easy study and remembrance. It is of importance to note that this treatise is given such pleasing and attractive exposition and couched in such precise and apposite language as compels our appreciation. With respect to both ideas on the subject dealt with and the language employed to clothe them, there is left nothing to be desired. Integrity, a quality which is rarely to be met with in architectural works like the *Mānasāra*, is the dominant note of treatment in the *Tantrasamuccaya*. The figure of speech that is present in the expression 'Gurudivākara etc.' is *Rūpaka* and it is explained in the following words by Śankara in his *Vimarśinī* :—

गुरुरेव दिवाकरो गुरुदिवाकरः सूर्यः तस्य भद्राः प्रसादयुक्ताः कटाक्षा एव रुचो रश्मयस्तैः स्फुरितस्य विकसितस्य हृदयकमलस्योदरेऽन्तर्भागे संभृतं संगृहीतम्। यथा दिवाकररश्मिभिः कमलानि विकसन्ति, तथा गुरोः प्रसादयुक्तैः कटाक्षरश्मिभिर्हृदयकमलस्य विकासनं सञ्जातमिति रूपकालङ्कारच्छलेन स्वगुरोर्दिवाकरनामत्वमपि सूचितम् ॥[10]

10. *Tantrasamuccaya* with *Vimarśinī*, Vol. I (T. S. S. Edition), p. 3.

## STANZA 3

*The Supreme is One, but His names and forms are various:*

Corresponding to the variety of forms in which the one Supreme personal God manifests Himself, different modes of worship are prescribed. The author proposes to deal with the modes in general and with respect to their particular application to particular deities. The author has not failed here to take note of the governing ideal of Hinduism, which is the recognition of one foundational spirit as the Supreme Person, who reveals Himself through diverse forms. Since taste and temperament are always variant in various men, the One God, who is Omniscient, Omnipresent and Omnipotent, appears differently to different minds. This difference in appearance is natural and inevitable in view of the manifold and varying disposition of the human mind. It is one of standpoint. Viṣṇu, Śiva and so many other names refer not to different persons but to different aspects of one Supreme Person, 'Parama Puruṣa' as the author prefers to call Him by an ultimate expression. The various names are distinguished corresponding to the different functions of God, and corresponding to the distinct attributes which denote the one God. It is the phases of one Supreme Personality that are personified and named as Viṣṇu, Śiva etc., and each phase here embodies a distinct and dominant quality. Thus in essence God is one, in standpoint he appears various. This note of an intelligent understanding of the deeper unity in the midst of diversity is found struck throughout the career of Hinduism. The Vedic poets tell us that poets with many words speak variously of the One Supreme Reality. The same fundamental note of unity, which the Vedic saying 'Ekam Sad viprāḥ bahudhā vadanti'[11] gives expression to, is seen underlying the conception of a personal God, who, as described by our author, is the One Supreme Person (Parama Puruṣa) called by different names such as Śrīśa (Viṣṇu), Īśa (Śiva) etc., according to the sphere of activity in which He functions and according to the excellence which is the dominant feature of His Personality. In this connection the following lines of the *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*[12] may be quoted :—

11. *Ṛg Veda*, I, 164, 46.
12. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* (T. S. S. Edition), Pāṭala III, stanzas 2, 3 and 4.

It further adds :— दर्पणानां बहुत्वे तु दृश्यते नैकता यथा ।
तद्वद् बहुत्वं मन्यन्ते विष्णोस्तस्याल्पचेतसः ॥
यथाम्भसीन्दुबिम्बानि प्रतिशब्दाश्च नैकधा।
एकोऽप्यात्मा बहुष्वेवमित्याहुस्तत्त्वदर्शिनः ॥ (St. 33, 34, 35.)

देवतेह परं ज्योतिरेक एव परः पुमान् ।
स एव बहुधा लोके मायया भिद्यते स्वया ॥
पुरुषाख्यः स्वयं मायां प्रकृतिं व्यज्य स द्विधा ।
स्थितस्त्रिधा च सत्त्वादिगुणभेदात् प्रतीयते ॥
विष्णुब्रह्मशिवाख्योऽसौ स्थित्युत्पत्त्यन्तकृन्मतः ।
मूर्तयो वासुदेवाद्या धर्मज्ञानादिभेदतः ॥

## STANZA 4

*"The Qualities of the Worshipper".*

The man who is impelled by the fundamental urge to worship, must first approach a proper preceptor. The construction of a temple and the installation of an image for the use of daily worship is considered an act of religious merit, and such an act is hailed and endorsed by sacred texts. The *Yamasaṃhitā,* a religious text[13] thus remarks:—

कृत्वा देवालयं सर्वं प्रतिष्ठाप्य च देवताम् ।
विधाय विधिवच्चित्रं तल्लोकं विन्दते ध्रुवम् ॥

The *Śaivāgamanibandhana* observes as follows:—

ये वै शिवालयं भक्त्या शुभं कारयतीप्सितम् ।
त्रिसप्तपुरुषाल्लोकं शम्भोर्नयति स ध्रुवम् ॥
तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन महादेवस्य मन्दिरम् ।
सर्वैरवश्यं कर्तव्यं आत्माभ्युदयकांक्षिभिः ॥[14]

The making of the House of God is thus held as a religious duty in India, and the present stanza relates to the qualification of the man who is entitled to get a temple constructed. He should be a man of intense devotional fervour and a man bent on the fulfilment of his duty towards his deity. He is one who strives for the attainment of communion or union with God through the select mode of daily worship. He is one who needs to be guided in the path of religion through the aid of rituals and who requires an image as a means of approach. Not having attained to the highest state of grace, he obtains spiritual vision through

13. Quotation from the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Vol. XIII, Part I, page 30.

14. Paṭala 13, concluding stanza (*Nibandhana,* a Ms. from Tripunithura).

the veil of imagery which appeals to ordinary imagination. He who thus feels the necessity of getting a temple and an image made should seek a 'Guru'. A further qualification is stated. He should be a man whose life is enriched by the observance of the laws which regulate man's life in India in its relation to *'Varṇa'* (caste), and *'Āśrama'* (stage of life). Every activity of Hindu life being theocratic in character, the qualification laid down in this stanza appears apposite.

## VARṆĀŚRAMA

The scheme of *Varṇāśrama* takes a prominent place in the pages of India's Cultural History. Hindu Dharma is the time-honoured code of conduct, sustained by the consciousness of generations of men. It deals, in the main with *Varṇas* (classes of society) and *Āśramas* (stages of individual life). It is a system devised to shape the character of man as an individual and as a member of a growing society. In a land like India, where peoples belonging to stocks of varied capacities are thrown together no system was found in ancient times which was more satisfying than the system of *Varṇāśrama.* It was devised to provide room for the full self-expression of individuals according to their mental and physical endowment as well as for the collective cultural progress of the society at large. Since it was found that Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras were dominating respectively more than others in the powers of thought and reflection, heroism and emotion, business-skill and industry, manual labour and service, society came to be classified accordingly into four orders of Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. In this social arrangement based on the original temperamental fitness of particular classes for particular kinds of work, Brahmin became the custodian of religious learning, Kṣatriya of protection of the people, Vaiśya of trade and industry, and Śūdra of manual service. The four classes thus arranged correspond to the intellectual, militant, industrial and labour orders. The conception of caste goes back to the Vedic times[15] and appears to have contributed towards the organic structure of society. "So early as the period of the *Ṛg-Veda* was the organic nature of society brought out by the metaphor of head, arms, trunk, and legs, answering to the four classes which are bound by ties of common fellowship. Each class has its appropriate place, rights and duties in the whole."[16] Pride and exclusiveness are later accretions, which poisoned the stream of social life when life became a competitive struggle for existence. As originally conceived and observed, caste rules relate to

15. *Ṛg Veda,* X, 90, 2.

16. Implication as understood by Sir S. Radhakrishnan, *vide* his *'Heart of Hindustan,'* p. 21.

the functions and expression of individuals with the common end of social progress in view, and respond to variety in human nature. Our forebears who led the van of culture never thought of refining races of unequal values to the point of extinction. On the contrary their assimilative genius sought, through the scheme of classes, to harmonise the divergent elements and transform them into integral parts of an organised society. As one of the best interpreters of Hindu culture would remark: "the four castes and orders are not intended to be special moulds into which the Indian people are thrown, but forms capable of embracing the whole humanity."[17] The traditional Hindu culture owes its life to the organic character of the Hindu social structure as conceived in the *Varṇa* ideal.

The ideal life of an individual being far way off from ordinary life, certain ways of living were laid down with a view to training man for the goal of life. These ways are the four stages of life known as the four 'āśramas'. The term 'Āśrama' comes from the root *'śram'* which means 'effort.' Through effort and sacrifice, through steady and disciplined life the ancients sought to overcome the evils that attend human nature. The Āśramadharma that they devised embodies the rules that govern the life of an individual who seeks ideal perfection. It divides an ideal life into four stages in close succession, the four stages being the stage of the student, of the householder, of the hermit and of the ascetic. The first stage is known as 'Brahmacarya', the stage of student-life. In this stage, man learns to dicipline desires, to habituate mind, to strengthen character and through education of self, prepares himself for the great world-task which lies ahead of him. The second stage is 'Gārhasthya', the stage of the house-holder. In this stage man enters into worldly activities and directs his energies into the channels of family life and social duties. Fully equipped for earthly work he keeps himself in tune with the spirit of enjoyment. It should not be supposed that enjoyment is the aim of life, but it is not wrong, at any rate, to be happy. For wisdom does not attain completeness without the whole living of life, and the life of the family-man forms an integral part of the whole life. In the third stage, namely 'Vānaprastha,' which is the stage of forest-life, man retreats from the competitive struggle in life and lives outside the fringes of cities. He is now in the world, but not of it. His aloofness is not complete detachment, for he keeps in touch with the life that moves about him and lives by the side of villages and towns. His life is one of plain living and high thinking. Unselfish activity for the benefit of the world is the characteristic feature of this stage. Through self-denial and extinction of earthly ambition he rises

17. '*Heart of Hindustan,* p. 56.

above the conflicts of worldly interests and thereby obtains the rare perception of the oneness and wholeness of humanity. Thus he prepares himself for the loosening of life's bonds. In the final stage known as 'Prāvrājyā', or renunciation, he steps out completely of all bonds and gives up gracefully all that has to go. In this final stage, he represents the highest type of manhood conceivable. Through the practice of 'Tapas', he annihilates the petty self in man, and what he awaits now is 'freedom across death.' With the realisation of the final stage, the liberated soul enters the Infinite and faces the Supreme Soul. Brahmacarya, Gārhasthya, Vānaprastha, and Saṃnyāsa—these constitute the four 'āśramas' or stages of life, passing through which the life of man becomes enriched, purified and sublimated. It is a life of this kind, a life with a meaning and an aim which befits man for his true home, which is the home of spirit, when lived from one end to the other. "For this four-fold way of life, India attunes man to the grand harmony the universal, leaving no room for untrained desires of a rampant individualism to pursue their destructive career unchecked, but leading them on to their ultimate modulation in the Supreme."[18]

## STANZA 5

In the above it has been said that the devotee whose life is governed by the laws of Hinduism should go to a preceptor (Guru). The qualifications of the 'Guru' forms the subject of the present stanza. The term 'Guru' as interpreted in the *Śabdakalpadruma,* means the instructor or teacher of the Vedas and Śāstras:—

गृणात्युपदिश्यति वेदशास्त्राणि ॥[19]

The term 'Ācārya' is often used as a synonym of 'Guru.' This word 'Ācārya' is employed in the sense of 'preceptor' who collects the meaning of Śāstras and establishes the authority of tradition through example and precept. The following definition conveys this meaning of the word 'Ācārya':—

आचिनोति च शास्त्रार्थान् आचारे स्थापयत्यपि ।
स्वयमाचरते यस्मादाचार्यस्तेन कथ्यते ॥[20]

Among the qualifications of a 'Guru' that which is mentioned first is that he should be a '*Vipra*' or priest.

18. Vide Tagore's *Religion of Man* (Lecture on Four Stages of Life), page 202.
19. *Śabdakalpadruma* under the term 'Guru'.
20. *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*.

*"Hieratic element in Architecture, a contribution of the 'Guru'."*

Temple architecture has always been the expression of religious spirit in India and art a means of edification. The priest, the custodian of learning, according to the Varṇa institution, influenced and controlled the science of architecture as he did the other modes of creative thought. The Śilpa-śāstras, which embody principles of Architecture and Sculpture, bear a clear stamp of the priestly authority. Since all rules came to be prescribed by the priest with due regard to the religious requirements of the public they exhibit a certain uniformity in their basic treatment. In the nature of the principles there is nothing that is accidental. The whole system being canonical, the priest came to be looked upon as the supreme director of architecture. Similar was the spirit prevalent in the Europe of middle ages till the end of the thirteenth century when the clergy fell out with the laity. The quarrel between the clergy and laity resulted in the emancipation of architectural activities from the control of the church. In India, on the other hand, the priest and the public always worked in a spirit of harmony and complete understanding. As Manomohan Gangoly would observe: "The architectural traditions in India have all along been theocratic in character; we have accordingly no such thing as Renaissance similar to what we find in Italy in the fifteenth century, or a little later in other parts of Europe. The same canonised system of design and construction is noticeable in all ages, and hence the necessity of Renaissance or reverting back to the classical style, or any style, never arose. "Back to Rome" was the cry of all the Renaissance period in Europe, but in India, we find a steady continuity of the same ideas; even architectural and sculptural details derived from the same basic principles are noticed everywhere."[21]

A comparison of our text with the *Mānasāra* and others on the subject of the director of architecture reveals a very interesting point with regard to his social status. The *Mānasāra* classifies 'Śilpins' into four divisions in order known as '*Sthapati*' (the master-builder), '*Sūtragrāhin* (the draughtsman), '*Vardhaki*' (the painter) and '*Takṣaka*' (the carpenter). 'Sthapati' is the *Guru* of all the rest and each, the *Guru* of the other below. Of the four classes, 'Sthapati' is described as the master-builder who is responsible for the whole structure. Among the qualifications stated, it is said that he should have all the characteristics of an *Ācārya* and that he should know the Vedas.[22] No reference is made to the caste of 'Sthapati,' though knowledge of the Vedas has been

21. J.B.O.R.S., Vol. XIII, Part I, page 31.
22. *Mānasāra*, chapter II, lines 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31.

laid down as one of his qualifications. In the Chapter entitled 'Balikarmavidhāna'[23] the Sthapati is described as playing the role of a priest while offerings are being made to the various deities presiding over the quarters. In the *Mayamata*[24] also the subject of 'Balikarma' is treated in a more or less similar manner. In both the texts, in the list of articles prescribed for offerings, references are not rare in respect of non-vegetarian dishes such as the meat of goats and other animals, blood, fishes dried or fresh and similar other objects.[25] These are intended as oblations to be offered to certain fierce deities with a view to pacifying them. A pious Brāhmin like the Nambūdiri of Malabar shuns flesh and blood, and his offerings to the deity are strictly vegetarian in character. As such, it is scarcely conceivable that the Sthapati, who is described as offering meat etc., should belong to the community of orthodox Brahmins as the Nambūdiris of Malabar. He, however, claims a status on a par with Brahmins, but it is restricted to the sphere of the performance of certain rites connected with building activity. Study of the Vedas seems to be a concession granted to him in view of the fact that he has to construct altars for sacrifice etc., in accordance with the rules laid down in the Vedas. Ānand K. Coomāraswāmy observes: "The Kammālars (as the craftsmen are called in South India) have certain sacerdotal privileges and can claim an equality with Brahmins".[26] Their claim, as we have observed, relates and is confined to certain ceremonials connected with their profession. The *śilpins* are skilled men, trained in professional work such as the casting of images, construction of temples and other arts and crafts. They may be described as workmen who meet the demand of society in respect of all arts and crafts including the art of building and image-making. Their profession is hereditary, and through constant practice they acquire remarkable skill. *The author of the Tantrasamuccaya draws a line of distinction between Guru (or Ācārya) and Sthapati (or Śilpin).* The one is the preceptor and the other a skilled and trained artist. The 'Sthapati' is described as a *śilpin* and the 'Takṣaka,' the carpenter is also called a *śilpin*. The Tantrasamuccaya does not refer to the four-fold classification of

23. *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII.
24. *Mayamata*, Chapter VIII (T. S. S. Edition).
25. Vide (a) *Mānasāra*, Chap. VIII, lines 39, 40, 51, 52, etc.
(b) *Mayamata*, Chapter VIII, stanzas 8, 9, 10, 15, etc.
(c) *Gurudevapaddhati* (Uttarārdha), Paṭala 27, stanzas 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, etc. (T. S. S. Edition Vol. III).
26. Indian Collections in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Part II (Sculpture), page 37.

*śilpins*; it understands all classes of builders in the general sense of *śilpin*, the trained worker in arts. In stanza 109, the author[27] states :—

रक्षामङ्गलपूर्वकं शुभनिमित्तर्क्षे शिलार्थं व्रजेन्मन्त्री शस्त्रिभिरन्वितः स्थपतिभिः कर्त्रापि चैन्द्र्यादिषु ॥

Here स्थपतिभि : is interpreted by Śaṅkara as शिल्पिभिः. In stanza 106, the author[28] says :—

किञ्चिन्निवेद्य परितोष्य सुरक्ष्य तक्ष्णा ।
प्रासादमारचयतां सहमन्त्रबिम्बम् ॥

Here तक्ष्णा is interpreted by the expression 'शिल्पिना' Though the *Sthapati* or *Śilpin* is ordinarily treated as different from a Brahmin, in his capacity as the builder he commands respect and is as highly honoured as the preceptor himself.

Thus the author directs :—

दध्यन्नमश्नातु गुरुः सकर्ता तत्रार्चनीयः स्थपतिश्च तद्वत ॥

Śaṅkara[29] comments on this statement in the following words :—

सकर्ता कर्त्रा सहितो गुरुः । दध्यन्नं दधिविशिष्टमन्नम् अश्नातु । तत्र कर्मणि स्थपतिः तक्षा च तद्वदर्चनीयः तस्याप्यन्नदानादिना प्रसादं कुर्यादित्यर्थः ॥

Thus according to the author of the *Tantrasamuccaya*, the Guru, the preceptor, is the director in all divine matters and he is the guide to be consulted in the course of the construction and consecration of the temple. He selects the site proper for temple construction; he performs the rites connected with the selection of the site. The offerings and sacrifices which come under the sphere of his activity are not found to include articles such as meat and fish. The first Paṭala contain rites and ceremonials which necessitate offerings to deities presiding over the various quarters. But in the list of articles intended for oblation or offering, we do not detect any reference to meat or fish. The offerings are composed of purely vegetarian articles such as the sacrificial grass, grain, rice, water, and butter or ghee or such other things. The offering of these pure articles is conducted by the Guru, the preceptor, who is a Brahmin.

27. *Tantrasamuccaya* (T. S. S. Ed.), Vol. I, page 42.
28. *Ibid.*, page 41.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

The following stanzas[30] reveal the nature of offerings and the conductor of the offerings :—

विरिञ्चं द्विपञ्चाशता देवताभिर्वृतं चार्चयित्वा यथोक्तक्रमेण।
अमुष्यै निवेद्याथ तद्देवताभ्यस्त्रिपञ्चाशते तत्र दद्याद् बलिं च॥
कुशप्रसूनाक्षतवारिहव्यैस्त्रिशः किरेद्र वास्तुचतुर्मुखाभ्याम् ।
सकृत् सकृत् तत्परितः परेभ्यो बहिर्ग्रहेभ्योऽञ्चितपञ्चकूरैः ॥
कृत्वा बलिं सलिलमत्र सकृत् सकृच्च दत्त्वा प्रसन्नयजनं प्रविधाय धातुः ।
तद्वास्तुदैवतकदम्बकृतावलम्बं प्राकारमध्यमवबुध्य करोतु रक्षाम् ॥

In accordance with the requirements of religious aspirants, the 'Guru', the preceptor, gets the temple constructed by workmen,[31] who are trained and skilled builders. He plays the role of the guide and director, and the *śilpins,* the trained workers, carry out the directions of the preceptor. Thus it is perfectly clear from the *Tantrasamuccaya* that all architectural principles as are found embodied in the *Āgamas* and avowed texts on the subject were evolved and established under the authority and direction of the priest. This fact should be borne in mind before we attempt at understanding the significance and development of Indian architecture. The writers of the *Manuṣyālayacandrikā* and *Śilparatna* also take notice of this fact in the wake of the author of the *Tantrasamuccaya.* The point we have observed is made clear by the *Manuṣyālayacandrikā* : Compare the stanzas quoted below[32] :—

मर्त्यो विप्रादिवर्णेष्विह भवनविधानोत्सुको यः स पूर्वं
विप्रं तद्देशसम्बन्धिनमखिलगुणैरन्वितं संवृणीत।
सोऽयं तद्वर्णयोग्यां क्षितिमथ परिकल्प्यात्र पूजादिकृत्वा
वास्तोः शास्त्रोक्तरीत्या गृहमतिनिपुणैः कारुभिः कारयेत ॥

वेदागमादिविहितान्यवधार्य विप्रैः
कार्यो विधिः सकलदेवनरालयानाम् ।
तद्वाक्यतः सकलधामसु मृच्छिलादे-
रन्योन्यमेलनमुशन्ति हि कारुकृत्यम् ॥
स्थपतिः सूत्रग्राही तक्षकसंज्ञश्च वर्धकिः क्रमशः ।
स्वोचितकर्मणि दक्षा ग्राह्यास्ते कारवश्चतुर्धेति ॥

30. *Tantrasamuccaya,* Vol. I, Paṭala I, stanzas 71, 72 and 73 (T. S. S. Ed.).
31. *Ibid.,* Paṭala II, stanza I, vide कारयेत् कारुभिः ॥
32. *Manuṣyālayacandrikā* (T. S. S. Ed.), chapter I, stanzas 9, 10 and 11.

कुलीनः The Guru, says the author, must be a '*Kulīna*,' a man of noble descent, endowed with all the qualities which characterise a fair family. He should have gravity of manners and dignity of character, and must be above low personal preferences. His conduct should be governed by time-honoured traditions, *ācarās* which are supported by the conscience of generations of men and sages of old. He must be modest in his behaviour and highly educated. He must establish shrines and undertake pilgrimages. He must be sincere in his work and commendable. He should possess the virtues of an ascetic and must be eminently generous. All these qualities which characterise a *kulīna* are enumerated in the verse from the Mahābhārata :—

आचारो विनयो विद्या प्रतिष्ठा तीर्थदर्शनम् ।
निष्ठावृत्तिस्तपो दानं नवधा कुललक्षणम् ॥[33]

कृतसंस्क्रियौघः—The Guru should, again, be one whose life becomes sanctified by the observance of all usages and ceremonies and sacrifices which govern the life of a Hindu from the moment when he is conceived in the womb till the hour of his death and still further. The *Gṛhyasūtras* and later law-books deal with a large number of popular customs and usages which refer to conception, birth of the child, naming of the child, its first feeding, shaving, initiation to the teacher, the student-life, marriage and discharge of the duties of the couple, ancestral sacrifice, funeral rites, death ceremonies and the like. These works make perfectly clear how religion permeates the entire existence of a Hindu to the extent that nothing is left to pass in the life of an individual without an attendant religious ceremony. The customs and ceremonials of the above character as they are found embodied in the *Gṛhyasūtras* and the law-books of the Hindus govern the life of every Hindu. In conformity with the time-honoured traditions of the country the author lays down that the life of the Guru should be one that has received higher sanctity by virtue of the observance of all the socio-religious ceremonials beginning with *Garbhādhāna*.

स्वधीतवेदागमतत्ववेत्ता :—The author further prescribes that the Guru should be a knower of the essence of the *Vedas* and the *Āgamas*. He should learn the meaning of the Vedas and the Āgamas under a well-known teacher. The Veda is respected since time immemorial as the store-house of all learning and it is therefore customary with Hindu

33. See *Śabdakalpadruma* under the word 'Kulīna.'

writers to trace the origin of every branch of human knowledge to the Vedas. With respect to the science of temple architecture and the office of image-worship, however, references are wanting in the Vedas.

*"Vedic religion—ani-conic."*

The early hymns of the Ṛg Veda which depict the life of very early Aryans indicate to some extent the character of a people who moved from place to place and came in contact with nature. Hence, in the Ṛg Veda, building of temples, which forms an essential condition of a long settled life does not appear as a part of Āryan religious activity. The Vedic religion, in the main consists in the worship of the great powers of nature by means of hymns and sacrifices without the use of temples or images. The Gods of the Ṛg Veda were for the most part personifications of natural phenomena such as the Sky, Earth, Sun, Dawn, Fire and Wind. "These deities were worshipped not in temples, but in the open air on a sacrificial ground, of which a detailed description is to be found in the 'Brāhmaṇas.' When the actual phenomenon before the eyes of the worshipper such as Agni, was prayed to, any definite anthropomorphic image was out of question, even in the case of the invisible Vāta (Wind), of whom a poet of the Ṛg Veda says that " one hears his roaring, but his form one does not see". Even Yāska, many centuries after the days of Ṛṣis, remarks (about 500 B.C.) in the *Nirukta*: What is seen of the Gods is not anthropomorphic at all."[34] "Did image worship exist among the Vedic Aryans ? "—this query was the subject of discussion between Professor Macdonell and Professor S. V. Venkateswara in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society[35] and in the Journal 'Rūpam.'[36] We are not able to detect any unmistakable and definite evidence to show that the Gods of the Ṛg Veda were iconographically represented in the earlier Vedic period. The arguments advanced by Professor Macdonell and the replies he has given to the objections of Professor Venkateswara appear to us quite incontrovertible. The character of the Vedic religion does not lend support to the supposition that image-worship was current among the Aryans of Vedic India. Venkateswara believes that there is indication of image in the Stanza 'Ka imam mama Indram krīṇāti.' (Rv. IV, 24, 10).[37] Dr. Ānanda K. Coomārswāmy remarks in this connection: " Just as the Boddhi-tree and pāduka at Bharhut are called " Buddha " (Bhagavato), so here

34. *The History of Hindu Iconography* by A. A. Macdonell in "*The Rupam,*" No. 4, October 1920, page 12.

35. J.R.A.S., 1916, 1917, 1918.

36. *Rupam,* No. 4, 1920 and *Rupam,* Nos. 43 & 44, 1930.

37. *Rupam* 1930, No. 44, page 21.

a symbol, may have been referred to as 'Indra' "[38] Two passages are quoted by Venkateswara: — (1) Indrāgnī śumbhatā naraḥ (Rv. I, 21, 21); (2) Sūrmyam sūṣirām iva (Rv. III, 69, 12). In these he seeks to find references to images.[39] His argument depends, in the first instance, upon the interpretation of the verb 'Śumbh,' which in the active means 'to adorn'. The hymn from which Venkateswara quotes invokes Indra and Agni to come to the sacrifice, to receive praise, and to drink the Soma offering. The stanza continues: tā yajñeṣu pra śaṁsata, Indrāgnī śumbhatā naraḥ tā gāyatreṣu gāyata; these two praise forth at sacrifices, adorn Indra and Agni, O men!, to these two sing in Gāyatrī measures". As 'Śumbhata' here comes between two verbs meaning "to praise," there can be no doubt that "with praises" must be supplied. It appears far-fetched to make this word to mean "adorn them (*i.e.*, their images) with ornaments." Even Sāyaṇa cannot be supposed to intend this interpretation. He paraphrases Śumbhata by 'śobhitau kuruta' "make them adorned," adding "nānāvidhairalaṁkāraiḥ," "with various ornaments" which is parallel to his explanation "gīrbhīr-alaṁkurvanti" under Rv. V, 22.4: tam tvā stomair vardhanty A' trayo, gīrbhiḥ śumbhanty Atrayaḥ "So the Atris exalt thee with praises, the Atris adorn thee with songs." (Sāyaṇa) (Stotrair vardhayanti—gīrbhir alṁkurvanti).[40] The second passage occurs in a hymn (VIII, 69) addressed to Indra, whose powers of drinking Soma are frequently dealt with upon in the Ṛg Veda. The stanza in question (12) is translated thus by Macdonell.[41] "Thou, O Varuṇa, art a good God, into whose palate (Kākudam) the seven rivers flow as into a hollow (Suṣirām) pipe (Sūrmyam)". The word 'Sūrmi' is interpreted in the St. Petersberg Dictionary in the sense of a 'pipe' for conveying water; in Sāyaṇa's Bhāṣya in the sense of 'sun'; in Nirukta in the sense of 'a fair-flowing stream'; in classical Sanskrit in the sense of an 'iron image'.[42] Macdonell adopts the meaning 'pipe' and remarks: "This is quite a natural parallel to the drinking powers of Indra, who is elsewhere said to consume three lakes of Soma; and of Varuṇa, as ruler of the waters, it is said (V, 85, 6) that by his occult power (māyā) the rivers swiftly pouring into the ocean do not fill it with water." In the present context, Sāyaṇa interprets 'Kākudam' by tālum (palate) as equivalent to 'Ocean'. The whole passage as interpreted by Sāyaṇa is as follows:

38. *History of Indian and Indonesian Art,* page 42.
39. *J.R.A.S.*, 1917, page 587.
40. J.R.A.S., 1917, pages 592-93, A summary of Macdonell's reply.
41. *Ibid.*
42. *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, discussion on the uses of Vyākaraṇa Śāstra, vide *Udyota* note under सुदेवो असि etc.

हे वरुण जलाभिमानिन् देव त्वं सुदेवो असि यस्य सुदेवस्य ते तव काकुदं तालु समुद्राख्यं सप्तसिन्धवः गङ्गाद्याः सप्तनद्यो अनुस्रवन्ति जिह्वायां सर्वदा स्रवन्ति। दृष्टान्तः सूर्म्यं सुषिरामिव यथा सूर्यं प्रति रश्मिजालं तद्वत् ॥

In the wake of Yāska's interpretation, Wilson thus translates the passage[43] :—

'Thou art a glorious God, Varuṇa, across whose palate the seven rivers keep pouring as *a fair-flowing (stream) into an abyss."*

[44]Griffith accepts the rendering of Roth and thus translates the stanza :—

> " Thou, Varuṇa, to whom belong seven
> Rivers, art a glorious God,
> The waters flow into thy throat as 'twere
> *a pipe* with ample mouth."

In view of the various translations and interpretations of the passage in question, it is not possible to determine the exact significance of the two expressions ' Sūrmi ' and ' Suṣira '. Except in the classical language we do not anywhere come across the meaning 'image' with reference to the word 'Sūrmi.' The two words are variously understood by various commentators, and if we may be allowed to say so these words also may be classified among the many 'winged words' which the Ṛg Veda presents. Macdonell observes : " Both these words occur in this passage only and consequently have a somewhat doubtful sense. Both words with a conjectural meaning must not be used in order to prove a theory of far-reaching importance."[45] He then concludes : " In the earlier Vedic period the Gods were conceived as vaguely anthropomorphic in outward shape, and were not yet iconographically represented."[46] Professor A. B. Keith also holds the view expressed by Macdonell and others. He says : " It is perfectly clear that save in the latest stratum of the Vedic literature idols are not recognised in cult, and then in the domestic ritual."[47]

It will be worthwhile in this connection to notice whether there is any proof to the effect that Indo-Europeans practised the use of idols,

43. Wilson's Ṛg Veda Saṃhitā (Translation), Vol. V.
44. " Hymns of the Ṛg Veda," Vol. II, p. 214.
45. *J.R.A.S.*, 1917, page 594.
46. *Ibid.*, page 602.
47. *Philosophy and Religion of the Veda* by A. B. Keith, page 30.

because the position in the case of other Aryan nations, such as Iran, Scythia and ancient Germany was much the same as in the Aryan India of early Vedic times. Dr. J. J. Modi who conducted investigation in this direction concludes: "we thus see that none of other ancient people —the Iranians, the Germans and the Scythians—who were offshoots of an old Aryan stock, had idol-worship among them. So, there should be no idol-worship among the ancient Hindus also, an old offshoot whose Ṛṣis sang their songs of Nature in their Hymns of the Vedas."[48] J. N. Farquhar, in an article on "Temple and Image worship in Hinduism" remarks: "In every part of India, temples and images may be seen; and the religious life of all classes of the people depends very largely on their use. Yet, the Aryans of Punjab from whom the religion of India with its priests, schools, laws, literature and customs has come, possessed no temples and used no images."[49] He then refers to the refusal of the Śrauta Brahmins (who continued to perform Vedic sacrifices) a hundred years ago to adopt the cult of images and subscribe to the view of the non-Vedic origin of temple ritual. Here, in the wake of Ānanda Coomāraswāmy he draws a line of distinction between *Yajña* of the Vedic cult and *Pūjā* of the temple cult, *Hotṛ* the Vedic priest and *Pūjārī* the temple priest. Coomāraswāmy observes: "In particular, the popular Dravidian element, must have played the major part in all that concerns the development and office of image-worship, that is, of *Pūjā* as distinct from *Yajña*."[50] In his essay on "Indian Architecture" Coomāraswāmy remarks: "The Vedic ritual required neither images nor temples, but the non-Vedic cults, such as those of the dragon (Nāgas), the tree-spirits (Yakṣas) and the goddesses, may have had permanent shrines with images and wooden temples."[51] He holds that the fundamental elements of temple architecture in India are indigenous and originated in the religious practice of the native population, much older and vaster than the Aryan population.

*"Image worship an element of the complex System of Hinduism"*

From the foregoing it might be said that the Vedic religion was normally ani-conic, and did not concern with the directions pertaining to the use and service of images and temples. The question now presents itself: What place does the study of the Vedas occupy in what concerns image worship and temple architecture? Something more might be added to

48. Sir Asutosh Mukerjee Silver Jubilee Volume, Orientalia, Part II, pages 437-448).
49. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1928, page 15.
50. *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, page 5.
51. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XII, p. 220, "Indian Architecture."

the answer that the reference to the Vedas was intended "to give the sanction of a great name to the science of architecture."[52] In order to estimate the total value of Vedic knowledge and to determine its position in the study of the sacred architecture of India, we have to first of all understand the true nature of the system of Hinduism, for the various treatises on image and temple worship took their shape at a time when Hinduism was completely evolved and when it became the vehicle of national religious thought and feeling. The great system of Hinduism, it may be remarked, "is not purely Āryan but Indian."[53] It springs from the fusion of Aryan with indigenous religion. The Aryans in the course of their civilising mission, met men of all grades of cultural equipment and religious instinct. They realised the force of image-worship which was inherent in the nature of the masses. Assimilative as the genius of the early civilisers was, it admitted the non-Aryan gods kindly, improved and chastened them where necessary and reconciled them with the Āryan deities. A higher and growing religion never extinguishes but always absorbs, ennobles, enriches and preserves all that is found to be good and inoffensive in older cults. It aims at putting peoples of different equipment in the line of development in social and spiritual directions. Real civilisers that they were, the later-day Aryans attempted to mend popular faith in personal and many gods, where such a mending was necessary. Their aim to gradually civilise the lower masses without hurting the religious sentiment rooted in their nature led them to accept the native religion and in their desire to ennoble the mode of popular worship they gave it the clothing of their philosophical wisdom. " The worshippers of the Mahisha (buffalo-demon) were told that the Cosmic Spirit was greater than the Mahisha. The worshippers of serpents were instructed that there was one greater than the Serpents, the Lord of Serpents, Nāgeśvara or Krishna, who danced over the head of Kāliya."[54]

The peaceful penetration of Aryan ideals into the sensuous polytheism of the popular religion marks the rise of Hinduism. As Havell observes: "Indian civilisation is like Hindu sacrificial vessel, an amalgam of many metals; but the fire which fused them and separated the dross was the Āryan genius—the philosophy of the Vedas."[55] Whether in the pure Āryan religion or in the complex system of modern Hindu-

52. *Annamalai University Journal,* Vol. IV, No. 2, "*Manuṣyālayacandrikā,*" note 22.

53. *The History of Indian and Indonesian Art,* page 46.

54. *The Heart of Hindustan,* page 52, also vide page 25.

55. *Indo-Aryan Civilisation,* page 45.

ism, the central ideal of unity in the midst of diversity is continuously expressed. Truly was Hindu faith built on the steady foundation of the Upaniṣads, which constitute the end and essence of the Vedas and the vital parts thereof. A good Guru, to whom people turn for spiritual advice cannot afford to ignore Vedic philosophy, which forms the source of spiritual wisdom and the basis of Hinduism. Hymns which accompanied the sacrifice in Vedic religion were incorporated in the mode of worship in the new Hinduism. Sacrificial altars too, in accordance with Vedic directions, were raised and certain rituals came to be adopted in the new system. Thus on the *philosophical* side as well as on the *ritualistic* side, Vedic contents have played a considerable part in the development of the system of Hinduism, the result of the welding of Aryan with popular religion. This *complex system of religion* which the *Āgamas* and *Purāṇas* embody in its highly developed state has been the spiritual food of millions since its inception. It has been continuously governing and still continues to be the ruling factor in the religious life of Hindus in India. The philosophy that clothes and ennobles the system has its roots deep in the system of Vedic thought. Dr. Coomārawāmy takes note of this fact when he observes that the 'Tantra (system) is based like other systems on the Vedas......and that the Tantra harmonises Vedāntic monism and dualism.'[56] In the light of the mixed character of Hinduism which a careful study unravels, it is possible to understand the rationale underlying the text of the author which tells us that the Guru, the spiritual adviser should be a knower of the essence of the Vedas and the Āgamas.

*"The term 'Āgama', its general and technical sense explained"*

The term 'Āgama' that is used in the expression '*Svadhītavedāgamatattvavettā* refers to the traditional text of worship, otherwise known as 'Tantra'. This term, divested of its technical and restricted sense, means any 'tradition' or 'scripture'. Monier Williams renders it as "anything handed down or fixed by tradition."[57] It is commonly used with reference to any sacred scripture including the Vedas. Thus Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya* speaks of '*Āgamaprāmāṇya*', where *Āgama* means the sacred text of the *Vedas*. However, this term is employed in a special sense in technical treatises dealing with temple and image worship. In our text, for instance, where the author uses the compound expression '*Vedāgama*', the fact is indicated that *Āgama* is distinct and different from the *Vedas*. '*Āgamas*' are a special class of works which inculcate the worship of

56. Bulletin on "Indian Collections in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts," Part I, page 30.

57. "*Sanskrit-English Dictionary*" by Monier-Williams.

Śiva and Śakti. They are otherwise known generally by the term *'Tantras.'* Belonging to a similar class of works, but specially devoted to the sect of Viṣṇu are the '*Saṃhitās*'. *Tantra* strictly means 'a system of doctrines,' 'a book'; *Āgama* 'tradition'; and *Saṃhitā* 'a collection of sacred texts.' Thus Winternitz observes: "Strictly speaking, the 'Smhitās' are the sacred books of the Vaiṣṇavas, the 'Āgamas' those of the Śaivas and the 'Tantras' those of the Śāktas. However, there is no clear line of demarcation between the terms, and the expression 'Tantra' is frequently used as a general term for this class of works."[58] They bear the mark of theological works instructing technicalities of the cult of sects together with their metaphysical and mystical principles. "Tantra (sysem) forms the specific system suited, according to the orthodox view, to the conditions of the fourth or kali age, and is designed equally for the use of any special sect."[59] The *Śaivāgamas,* which are also known by the common term 'Tantras', are said to be twenty-eight in number and are believed to have been pronounced by Śiva after the creation of the world. An interesting verse, which we have noticed already, describes them as the utterances come from the mouth of Śiva in response to the queries of Pārvati and endorsed subsequently by Vāsudeva. In their content, they deal with the cult of symbolic and image worship and in the course of their description of the sectional and devotional elements of worship, there is devoted, in these works, a large portion to the treatment of architectural and sculptural subjects. The *'Kāmikāgama,'* for instance, deals with architecture and sculpture in sixty out of a total of seventy-five chapters. In this respect it rivals any avowed treatise on architecture. A student interested in the temple architecture and image worship of this land, cannot afford to pass by the *Āgamas* in silence. They are encyclopaedic in the nature of their treatment and govern the spiritual life of millions of Hindus in India. Among the class of Āgamic works, twenty-eight Āgamas are usually enumerated and each 'Āgama' has a number of *Upāgamas*. The following stanzas attributed to 'Svāyambhuva' are found quoted in the *Gurudevapaddhati*[60] :—

" कामिकं योगजाचिन्त्यकारणान्यजितं तथा ॥
दीप्तं सूक्ष्मं सहस्रं चाप्यंशुमान् सुप्रभेदकम् ।
शिवभेदसमाख्यानि तन्त्राण्येवं दश क्रमात् ॥

58. *The History of Indian Literature* by Winternitz (Cal. Ed.), page 587.
59. Bulletin of the Boston Museum on Indian Collections, Part I, page 30.
60. *Gurudevapaddhati,* (T. S. S. Ed.), Vol. III, pp. 5 and 6.

विजयं चैव निःश्वासं प्रोद्गीतं पारमेश्वरम् ।
आग्नेयं मुखबिम्बं च स्वायम्भुवमतः परम् ॥
रौरवं माकुटं चैव किरणं लम्बितं तथा ।
चन्द्रज्ञानं वीरभद्रं सिद्धं सान्तानिकं ततः ॥
शर्वोद्गीतं च विमलं वातूलं चेत्यनुक्रमात् ।
रुद्रभेदोद्भवान्येव तन्त्राण्यष्टादशैव हि ॥
एषां भेदोपभेदाश्च तत्तत्प्रकरणान्यपि ।
सुबहूनित्यतोऽस्माभिर्निर्दिश्यन्ते न नामभिः ॥
उपभेदेन भेदानामस्य संख्या न विद्यते ।
भेदान्तराणि सर्वाणि महान्ति न महान्त्यपि ॥"

These verses enumerate the 28 Āgamas.

*"Indigenous (non-Vedic) origin of Image Worship"*

Beneath the philosophical garb which the Āgamaśāstras display there runs the popular tendency to worship Gods in anthropomorphic terms to the accompaniment of the ritual known as '*Pūjā*', which is distinct and different from '*Yajña*'. Since no Vedic work describes or prescribes the ritual of temple and image worship, there is ground to believe that its origin is non-Vedic. "Indian religion and ritual," says Ānanda Coomāraswāmy, "exist in two forms, known to Indians as the Vedic and the Āgamic tradition, but more often designated by western scholars as respectively Āryan (Brahmanical) and Dravidian (Southern) and popular."[61] Vedic Aryans, as we have already observed, were worshippers of deities who are personifications of natural phenomena and their ritual '*Yajña*' was composed of offerings offered to the accompaniment of hymns sung in praise of the Gods invited to attend the sacrifice. There is no indication or reference to temple in Vedic literature, but there is description of sacrificial altars which were used to be raised in the open air. The priests through hymns summoned the Gods to descend and attend the sacrifice prepared in their honour. It was believed that in response to the invitations extended, Gods descended to the altar flying from heavens in their aerial cars. The ritual and liturgy connected with the Aryan sacrifice (*Yajña*), is entirely different in essentials from the original ritual of image-worship (*Pūjā*). According to the Vedic ritual '*Yajña*', offering of milk, grain and butter and juice of the

61. Article on "Indian Art and Archaeology" in the *Encyclopaedia Brittannica*, Vol. XII, page 209.

Soma plant was mainly put in the fire kindled on the altar and it was believed that what was thus offered reaches the Gods as Agni (the fire) was the mouth of Gods. According to the Āgamic ritual *Pūjā*, the service a personal deity is emphasised, and offerings took the shape of sandal, flowers, clothes, incense, food and light. Such a ritual obviously implies the existence of images and temples to house the images. It is not possible to determine the age of this tradition, since it is a tradition rooted in the religion of the masses. Various scholars suggest that this tradition is indigenous and as such contemporaneous with the life of the native race. Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, one of the distinguished exponents of this view, remarks : " It must always be remembered that the Vedas exhibit only a certain aspect of early Indian religion. Behind the pale of Aryan orthodoxy there lay an extensive and deep-rooted system of popular beliefs and cults and a decided tendency to anthropomorphic presentation. These popular beliefs implied an iconography, such as we actually find at Bharhut, of Yakṣas, Nāgas, Devatas and Vṛkṣas, the Earth and Mother Goddess and divinities of fertility, fairies and goblins and human heroes. Gradually all of these found their place in a theistic Hinduism and Buddhism, which were not purely Aryan, but Indian."[62] If we do not have enough tangible and material evidence of images and temples going back to the remote period of Āryan and pre-Āryan civilisation, it is because they were made probably of such evanescent material as wood and mud. A peep into the civilisation of the Indus Valley of the third millennium B.C. enables us to detect some evidence, however inadequate, on the strength of which we might justify the supposition that so far as it was possible of being expressed in concrete forms, the religion of the Indus people in several respects was the progenitor of modern Hinduism as a religion, and as distinct from the philosophical side of it. Of course, among the buildings unearthed there is none that definitely shows itself to be a temple. But some materials in the form of engraved seals which are found in abundance in the ruins along with a few clay sealings and copper tablets and a variety of small figurines of terra-cotta shed some amount of light on the religion of the Indus Valley people of the third millennium B.C. A study of these objects has led modern scholars to trace certain features which are common between the old Indus Valley religion and modern Hinduism. Among such features mention is often made of the cults of Śiva and the Mother-Goddess, of the Nāgas and the Yakṣis, the worship of animals, trees, stones, phallism : Yoga, Śaktism and the doctrines of Samsāra (Metempsychoses) and Bhakti (devotion to a personal God). These later constitute the cardinal elements of Āgamic

62. *"History of Indian and Indonesian Art,"* page 46.

and Paurāṇic literature. On the strength of the material evidence which the Mohenjo-Daro remains yield, it appears that the authors of this civilisation were a set of highly cultured people who should not be mistaken for the predecessors of modern jungle tribes. In view of the concrete character of the religion of these people of the third millennium B.C., it will be unreasonable to assert that image worship was unknown to the people of ancient India. When we say that there is no evidence of image-worship in the Vedic literature, we only mean that image worship was not the practice of the Vedic Aryans. We are not thereby precluded from assuming that it was existing among non-Aryans of those distant times. It seems to have prevailed among the non-Aryan population whose religious tradition was distinct and different from the Aryan tradition.

From the religious literature of the Iranians who formed one of the chips of the Aryan block, we know that idolatry was an object of condemnation. As Jackson remarks, "all Pahlavi writings allude to the abomination of idol-worship as wholly abhorrent to the pure spirit of Zoroastrianism that is in keeping with its ideal conception of the divine."[63] In Viśtāspa yaśt (yt. XXIV, 37) Zoroaster asks his royal disciple Viśtāspa to keep away from idolatry, which was an evil, an infection from Ahriman. In the same yaśt (59), Ahura·Mazda advises the rejection of idol-worship and the acceptance of pure *Gāoā*—singing. The word used to refer to idolatry is '*baosu*'. In Pahlavi, '*būt parastik*' is employed, which means idolatry. In later Persian, '*būt parastik*' is employed, which means idol-worship, and the Persian word '*būt*' comes from the Avesta 'būiti' (Ven. XIX, 1, 2, 43). In Pahlavi Bundehish, the following passage is found:—'*Būt shāeda zak mūnash pavan Hindukān parastand' Avash Vakhsh pavan zak butiha mahman chegūn būt-i asp parastet* (Ch. XXVIII, 34)[64] (i.e. the demon *būt* is one who is worshipped among the Hindus. The increase (of its worship) consists in idols. For example they worship the idol of a horse).[65] The fact that idolatry was disliked by the Iranians presupposes its prevalence among some people. We, therefore, are not prevented from holding that image worship was current as a tradition in the religi-

63. "Sir Jamshedjee Jijibhoy Zarthosthi Madressa Jubilee Volume," page 274. Article on '*Allusions in Pahlavi Literature to the Abomination of Idol-worship.*'

64. Vide Modi's Bundehish, pp. 138-139.

65. For these references from Iranian Literature, vide Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volume, Orientalia, Part II, page 442, Modi's article on "Idol-worship: Did it exist among the ancient Aryans, and among them among the ancient Hindus of the Vedic time?"

ous practice of the indigenous population of India before as well as after the advent of the Aryans. This view is strengthened by the concrete character of the religion of the Indus Valley people of pre-historic period whose civilisation, thanks to the spade-work of archaeologists, has been revealed in a sudden and completely unforeseen manner.

Among other supporters of the theory of indigenous origin of image worship mention might be made of Prof. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar, who in his *"Outlines of Indian Philosophy"* observes: "Temple ritual was elaborated on a grand scale. This ritual was primarily based on the ceremonies of fetish worship of the Dravidian races".[66] Professor Radhakrishnan subscribes to the view in the following words: "Image worship, which was a striking feature of the Dravidian faith, was accepted by the Aryans".[67] Dr. A. B. Keith in his *"Philosophy and Religion of the Veda"* tells us that this view is plausible. He observes: "There is no proof that the Indo-Europeans practised the use of idols and the evidence of German religion suggests that the position there as certainly in Iran was much as in Vedic India, and it is therefore, perhaps more plausible to believe that their employment gradually developed in India itself, though under what influences, we simply do not know." He, however, suggests: "The use of idols may have been influenced by non-Aryan population, as it gradually became assimilated; it may have used them and had fixed sanctuaries before the advent of the Aryans".[68] One of the recent inquirers in this subject, J. N. Farquhar, holds the view that "temple-and-image worship grew up among Śūdras (Dāsas of the Ṛv.), that it was thrown open to the three Āryan castes about 400 B.C. and thereafter steadily climbed to its present supreme position.[69]

*"The Age of Āgamic tradition and the Āgama Śāstras".*

All the statements of different scholars that we have referred to above lend support to the view that the tradition of image–and–temple worship was inherent in the soil of India, that it was rooted in the faith of her people. It might have existed in a floating state till it was systematically recorded. Since it was alien to the liturgy and ritual of Āryan religion, since it was not a feature of Āryan mode of worship, the Āryan advents did not take note of it in their religious literature. This seems to be the reason why the practice of image–worship does not appear reflected in the literature before the fourth

66. *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, page 128.
67. *Hindu View of Life*—Page 41.
68. *"Religion and Philosophy of the Veda,"* (pages 30 and 31).
69. J.R.A.S., 1928, page 21.

century B.C. But from the fourth century B.C. onwards, in such works as the *Adbhuta Brāhmaṇa, Gṛhya-sutra,* etc., we come across fragmentary references to image-worship.[70] A definite account of the details of the mode of image-worship, however, can be gathered from the systematic treatises on the subject (*Āgamas,* etc.) prepared at a later date. In the codified form in which the *Āgamas* have come down to us, they were probably written from about the fifth or the sixth century A.D. The works of Tirumūḷar and other Tamil poets unfold familiarity with Āgamic literature. H. W. Schomerus believes that these poets lived somewhere near the first or second century and concludes that the *Āgamas* would have, therefore, originated in pre-Christian times. Dr. Winternitz[71] thinks it more likely that these poets should be assigned to the 9th century and the *Āgamas* to the 7th or 8th century A.D. As the word 'Tantra' is not explained in its technical sense by Amara, as allusions to 'Tantra' are not met with in the Mahābhārata, whereas allusions to 'Purāṇas' and 'Itihāsas' are frequently to be met with there, and as references to Tantras are not found in the works of Chinese pilgrims, Winternitz assumes that the *Āgamas* or *Tantras* could not have been written earlier than the 5th or 6th century A.D. Says he: "The earliest Nepalese manuscripts of Tantras date from the seventh to the ninth century, and it is not very likely that this literature originated further back than the 5th or 6th century".[72] Āgamas or Tantras, from their contents appear to mark the genesis of the new Hinduism, which is the outcome of the fusion of Aryan and indigenous concepts. In the character of the writings of this class of literature, the hand of the priestly authority is fairly discernible. The impact of Āryan philosophy on the class of Āgamic literature is clearly the work of the priestly class. This fact strengthens the view that in the form in which the Āgamic works have come down to us, they belong definitely to a date after the end of the Vedic period. Modern Hinduism with its comprehensive mission of civilising the aborigines by giving them a systematised religion divested of all evil practices and crude demonstrations and yet quite appealing to imagination, starts its career after the completion of the Vedic epoch. Mr. James Kennedy writes: "The absorption and assimilation of these aboriginal or foreign masses within the Hindu fold was the task of the

70. For evidences from Sūtra literature, Vide Introduction in *Indian Images,* part I, by Brindāvan C. Bhaṭṭāchārya. B. C. Bhaṭṭāchārya seems to press his claim too far when he seeks to find sure indication of image-worship in the passages from the R.V.

71. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature,* Vol. I, page 588, (Cal. Edition).

72. *Ibid.,* page 605.

new Hinduism, a task accomplished between the seventh and eleventh centuries A.D. and it was so thoroughly done that we now find throughout northern India a Hindu population fairly homogeneous in blood, culture, and religion, and sufficiently marked from the degraded tribes that still haunt the outskirts of civilisation."[73]

In the foregoing we have tried to point out how the priestly class, who were originally the custodians of pure Āryan religion, admitted in the early centuries of the Christian Era the popular and non-Aryan tendencies of worship and evolved and shaped with wonderful power of adaptability the system of modern Hinduism in which is found chiefly all that concerns image-worship recognised and systematised in relation to Āryan philosophies. Though it is not easy to determine the exact date for the composition of the Āgamic texts, their contents which are clothed in monistic philosophy of the Vedānta, enable us to suggest that they are post-Vedic works, shaped in the course of the evolution of Hinduism in the early centuries of the Christian Era. The fundamental elements of image-worship which these Āgamic texts embody, may, however, be supposed to trace their connection with the indigenous tradition whose age we simply do not know, except that it is ancient and probably as ancient as the religious faith of the native population of India.

वर्णाश्रमाचारपरः—The Guru should be one who observes the established traditions of the society, traditions which are recorded in the Hindu code of life and conduct with reference to the classes of society and stages of life. Here as elsewhere architecture is governed by the growing needs of the society and in its expression it is shaped by the established traditions of the society. The author hence observes that the directions of the Guru must keep conformity with the spiritual requirements of the classes. The science of architecture, developed and expressed under the guidance of the priest, the follower of social and religious traditions, reveals religious history, not of individuals but of whole classes in India.

अधि दीक्ष :—The work that a preceptor undertakes being of a sacred and serious character, he must place himself under strict laws of discipline. *Dīkṣā* is a religious ceremony which a religious man is required to observe with a view to initiating himself to great spiritual undertakings. It is believed that the observance of the laws of spiritual drill is necessary in order to awaken the inner spiritual life and to kindle one to full self-consciousness. This doctrine of Dīkṣā

73. *Imperial Gazetter* (Vol. II, chapter viii).

(initiation to spiritual undertakings) is one of the leading concepts which characterise *Tāntrik systems.*

दक्ष :—The preceptor should be again a man endowed with skill in performance. In any undertaking, but more in art, is ingenuity a requisite and the director of architecture must be a man of rare skill and intelligence.

*"Influence of the quality of Tapas on the character of Hindu Architecture."*

तपस्वी . The author then lays down that the Guru must be a 'Tapasvī', a man who possesses the ascetic virtues of simplicity, purity, and self-sacrifice. Simplicity is the result of the shedding of worldly desires with a view to achieving final illumination. It is the nature of the untrained mind to force its way towards distraction and wastage and lose itself in the fictitious value of things. A simple and austere life is intended to discipline the mind, to strengthen the will, to free man from the fetters of animal passions and to lead him to the higher goal of satisfaction of the Eternal Passion of the Soul. Let not asceticism be understood in the sense of mere self-mortification; for a real ascetic is not one who fiercely is 'in love with a lingering suicide.' Such a practice is condemned in ethical works. Bhagavad Gītā thus states[74] :—

मूढग्राहेणात्मनो यत् पीडया क्रियते तपः ।
परस्योत्सादनार्थं वा तत्तामसमुदाहृतम् ॥

Self-restraint as different from 'lingering suicide' is the meaning of austerity. The ascetic through the practice of the virtues of austere simplicity and purity and sacrifice of worldly appetites works for the salvation of himself as well as the world. He knows that what is gained through sacrifice is truly and eternally gained. He, therefore, through discipline and penance puts an end to the promptings of brute nature. A seeker after truth that he is, he leads the life of contemplation on the Eternal. A 'tapasvī', as described in Indian literature, is thus a man of serene mind who lives in an atmosphere of simple life and purity in response to the deeper call of spiritual reality. His activity is disinterested, not determined by personal motives. The art of religious architecture, when it is the product of the imagination of such serene and spiritually trained minds, necessarily acquires a transcendental character. There is in it no attempt at pandering to individual fancy or ministering to personal vanity. On

74. Bhagavadgītā, XVII, 16.

the other hand, there is suggested a sublimity, a monumental calm in which eternity seeks to echo itself. Such an art as this functions as the missionary of religion and philosophy, as the spiritual helper of mankind. It reveals to the religious-minded beauty which is spiritual, which is visioned through the shedding of intense worldly desires.

The commentator Śaṅkara interprets the word 'tapasvi' as "बहुप्रकारतपोयुक्तः" :—one who is gifted with different kinds of spiritual experience obtained through the practice of Tapas. Three kinds of asceticism are described—*Śārīra, Vāṅmaya* and *Mānasa*, from the point of view of its relation to the body, speech and mind. The following stanzas[75] describe the three kinds :—

देवद्विजगुरुप्राज्ञपूजनं शौचमार्जवम् ।
ब्रह्मचर्यमहिंसा च शारीरं तप उच्यते ॥
अनुद्वेगकरं वाक्यं सत्यं प्रियहितं च यत् ।
स्वाध्यायाभ्यसनं चैव वाङ्मयं तप उच्यते ॥
मौनः प्रसादः सौम्यत्वं मौनमात्मविनिग्रहः ।
भावसंशुद्धिरित्येतत्तपो मानसमुच्यते ॥

The word '*Tapas*' is interpreted in a variety of ways. Originally, it appears to have been used in the sense of "heat", "*creative heat*" analogous to the heat by which brood-hen produces life from the egg. In the poem of Creation in the Ṛg Veda,[76] it is found used in the sense of creative heat. Macdonell, in his 'Vedic Index', interprets it as "creative fervour."

"*Sa tapas taptvā sarvam asṛjata yadidam kiñca*" :—Quoting this Vedic passage the poet Rabindranath Tagore thus interprets :[77] "God from the *heat of pain* created all that there is." Here the expression "*pain*" is used in a special sense, in the sense in which Mathew Arnold has used it when he addressed a poem to "Nightingale."

" .........hark what pain!"

exclaims the poet, and further in a burst sings

"Eternal Passion!
Eternal Pain!"

Here 'pain' does not mean what is generally meant by that term in the limited sense of personal injury. It is an idea detached from the con-

75. Vide quotation given in the *Śabdakalpadruma* under 'Tapas.'
76. *Ṛg Veda*, X, 129.
77. "Creative Ideal" by Dr. Tagore in the *Rupam* No. 9, page 8, (1922).

finement of individual facts. It is to be interpreted in the context of ever-lasting life, where it is not different from the unfathomed joy in which all sufferings are made one with it. "The sacrifice," observes the poet Tagore, "which is in the heart of creation is both joy and pain at the same time".[78] For the same Vedic poets, who have sung the 'truth of pain in eternity' have also said "From joy has come forth all creation." The expression 'Pain' that is used in the interpretation of 'Tapas' must be understood in the particular poetic sense. It reveals, in this sense, the infinity of love and joy in all its truth and beauty. In the wake of Arnold, Dr. Tagore remarks that all creation throbs with 'Eternal Passion', 'Eternal Pain'. Dr. Coomaraswamy takes note of the different meanings which the expression 'tapas' suggests. "It implies," says he "something much more than penance, something more like *effort*, work, or glowing".[79] Effort in its utmost may be taken to be identical with what Tagore calls "heat of pain", the cause of universal creation. If we grant the various interpretations of 'Tapas', we might answer the question: what is Art-? It is the outcome of man's creative heat, creative fervour, creative activity. Just as all creation comes forth from the power of God's *tapas* so does art, man's creation proceed from his *tapas*. In the light of the various meanings we have noticed, the Guru who is described as a *tapasvī* is a man who possesses the power of *tapas* (creative heat, creative fervour, creative activity, which is capable of projecting what is called "art").

The qualities of a Guru enumerated in the following verses[80] may be compared with those laid down in our text:—

मन्त्रगुरोर्लक्षणम्

गकारः सिद्धिदः प्रोक्तो रेफः पापस्य हारकः ।
उकारो विष्णुरव्यक्तस्त्रितयात्मा गुरुः परः ॥
शान्तो दान्तः विनीतश्च कुलीनः शुद्धवेशवान् ।
शुद्धाचारः सुप्रतिष्ठः शुचिर्दक्षः सुबुद्धिमान् ॥
आश्रमी ध्याननिष्ठश्च मन्त्रतन्त्रविशारदः ।
निग्रहानुग्रहे शक्तो गुरुरित्यभिधीयते ॥
उद्धर्तुं चैव संहर्तुं समर्थो ब्राह्मणोत्तमः ।
तपस्वी सत्यवादी च गृहस्थो गुरुरुच्यते ॥

78. *Ibid.*

79. *Bulletin of the Boston Museum*, "Section on Sanyāsa and Yoga," part I, page 7.

80. *Śabdakalpadruma*, under "मन्त्रगुरोर्लक्षणम्"

## STANZA 6

*" The Status of Guru and Mūrtipas."*

In stanzas* from 6 to 27, the author deals with the process connected with the veneration of the Guru and the Mūrtipas, the characteristics and number of the Mūrtipas and the obligation of the Guru and the Mūrtipas to the devotee who requests them to fulfil his desire to build a temple and install an image for daily worship. Since we have no concern with the practical side of the ceremonial duties, we make only a passing reference to the ceremonial subject which these stanzas treat of. These verses, however, are of immense use to those who are interested in the study of Tāntrik rites. The doctrine of Guru is a characteristic of all devotional faiths and in Tāntrik system much stress is laid on it. Guru is here treated as the very embodiment of God Himself. The idea of Guru as God raises him to the dignity of God's 'Avatar' (incarnation). The Viṣṇusaṃhitā regarding the status of Guru remarks :—

[81]देवस्तु द्विविधो ज्ञेयः स्थावरो जङ्गमस्तथा ।
प्रतिमा स्थावरो देवः आचार्यो जङ्गमस्तथा ॥

While under 'Dīkṣā' discipline the Ācārya initiates eight Brahmins into spiritual work and appoints them as his associates in the religious task undertaken. These eight associates or disciples are called 'Mūrtipas' (those who protect the Mūrtis representing the different aspects or constituent elements such as earth etc. committed to their care by the Ācārya during the Dīkṣā period). While under initiation, the *Guru* is venerated as an incarnation or visible embodiment of the supreme God and the *Mūrtipas* as representations of the different aspects or constituent elements such as Earth etc. Gurudeva makes this point clear in the following stanzas :—

एवं क्ष्माग्न्यात्मसूर्याम्बुवाय्विन्दुव्योमसंज्ञिताः ।
मूर्तयोऽष्टौ शिवस्योक्ता जगद्यन्त्रप्रवर्तिकाः ॥
शर्वो रुद्रः पशुपतिरीशानश्च तथा भवः ।
उग्रश्चैव महादेवो भीमश्चेत्यष्ट मूर्तिपाः ॥
एवं क्षित्यादिशर्वादिमूर्तिमूर्तीश्वरात्मकान् ।
अभ्यर्च्य ब्राह्मणानष्टौ गन्धपुष्पाम्बरादिभिः ॥
आचार्यं च विशेषेण संपूज्याभिप्रणम्य च ।

* Tantrasamuccaya T. S. S. Ed., Paṭala 1.

81. *Viṣṇusaṁhitā,* Paṭala 16, stanza 2 (T. S. S. Edition).

ततस्तु वरयेदेतान् यजमानः प्रसन्नधीः ॥
शिवलिङ्गप्रतिष्ठार्थमाचार्यं त्वामहं वृणे ।
एभिर्मूर्तिधरैः सार्धं प्रासादं कुरु मे विभो ॥
इत्युक्त्वा यजमानस्तान् प्रणम्य वरयेच्च ते ।
आचार्यसहिता ब्रूयुर्यजमानं तथास्त्विति ॥
ततः सङ्कल्पिते देशे स्वानुकूलदिनादिके ।
भूमेः प्राकारसीमान्तं ज्ञात्वा कुर्यात् परिग्रहम् ॥[82]

In Paṭala 26, Gurudeva prescribes in detail the rites connected with the topics of *Guruvaraṇa*. The *Guru* and the *Mūrtipas* after having received from the *Yajamāna* all the honours due to them, should accede to the request of the *Yajamāna* and promise that the sacred task projected, beginning with the selection of site for the temple and ending with the consecration and bathing of the image, will be accomplished. Then the *Guru*, together with the *Mūrtipas*, must start to fulfil the obligation to the worshipper.

## STANZA 7

## SELECTION OF SITE

The author now proceeds to lay down rules for the selection of the site with due regard to its situation. A description of the features in general of the environment is first given. In the building of the House of God great enthusiasm was exhibited in the past and no one thought of building man's home more firmly and finely than he thought of the House of God. Greatest attention was centred on the selection of surroundings for the temple, and in the selection, the guiding factor was the intense feeling of man for close association with nature. India does not appear to have been led by any ambition to prevail over nature. The best minds, as the early history of India shows, blossomed in the heart of a lavish nature. The most enchanting songs which the Vedic poets sang were effusions of the unsophisticated human heart which had deepest contact with a creative nature. Nature, to Aryans, was also the perennial source of many a charming myth and legend. The *Āraṇyakas* and *Upaniṣads*, which embody the highest thoughts on the nature of Soul and the Universe, were expressed by the sages of old during their stay

82. *Gurudevapaddhati* (Vol. III, T. S. S. Edition), Uttarārdha, Paṭala 26, stanzas 64-70.

in forest. The first researchers in the realm of spirit, the Vedic Ṛṣis found fitting abode in woods that abound in hoary trees, cool shades and refreshing streams. Whether it is in primeval poetry, or religion or philosophy or any other conceivable activity of the human mind, influence of nature is deeply marked. Art of architecture, it is in the fitness of things, should also bear the same impact which nature has left on every phase of the creative activity of Indians from the times of the Ṛg Veda. Prolific nature, which sums up the ultimate beauty in God's creation is the source of keen delight to the human mind. It is the spring of inspiration and creative energy to the poet and the artist. To the philosopher who loves to contemplate the Eternal, no place is more satisfying than the one where Nature stands as 'an abiding presence, a revelation of quietude and tranquil repose in the midst of the whirl and unrest of life or the ceaseless bewildering flux of things.' To the imagination of the devotee nature in all her splendour and grandeur appeals as God's creation, and evokes in him a sense of admiration at God's mysterious ways of working. In the situation of a temple, special regard is therefore given to natural surroundings. All texts on architecture are insistent on the proper selection of site and the stanza under explanation prescribes for temples choicest beauty spots in woodland and mountain-scenery, in forest glades and hilly retreats, in river-sweeps and sea-shores, in any lovely place in the heart of Mother Nature. Where such a nature is not revealed as in a town or a city, the author suggests that a suitable environment might be created through the tending of beautiful gardens and groves.

In the first line the author refers to '*Tīrtha*'. '*Tīrtha*' is a holy place, the centre of pilgrimage. A temple, when erected in such a place where people of diverse parts assemble for a common purpose, serves to advertise spiritual conceptions, and bring home to the minds of the humblest the highest teachings of religion and philosophy. For the temple, as we know, is the centre of India's cultural and spiritual life. This fact explains the characteristic feature of Indian culture, namely unity in the midst of diversity. True, that everywhere among the settled people, Indian culture has acquired particular local colour, but the fact that a certain intellectual and spiritual uniformity exists throughout the provinces of this country deserves to be remembered. The cultural bond persists in spite of political or racial differences and the unity, which is the characteristic feature of Indian culture is the product of a uniform spiritual life that has its roots in such centres of common worship as the *Tīrthas* or holy places.

*Vana, Śaila* and *Taṭinī* wood, mountain and stream. Temples, if built on spots girded by forests, mountains and streams possess the

advantage of escaping from injury at the hands of invaders. Temples in North India have suffered immensely at the hands of plunderers. Compared with the North, South India had but to offer little resistence to the destructive energies of invaders and the fury of iconoclasts. South India enjoyed comparatively more of the mighty protection afforded by forests and mountains against the march of inroads from the north. Here, there are temples which are mostly located in safe corners and encircled by woods which are impenetrable except to the zeal of the devotee.

*Upavana* is a grove tendered in the vicinity of a village. *Udyāna* is a garden nurtured by man. The atmosphere of a temple is made happy and refreshing by the presence of a garden or grove in its neighbourhood. Every temple has gardens all around reared for the supply of flowers to the deity. The three words *Vana, Upavana,* and *Udyāna* are distinguished from each other on the basis of their size and wild or artificial character of their growth. Similarly, the three terms *Grāma, Pura* and *Pattana* are differentiated from each other. *Grāma* corres–ponds to a village, *Pura* to a capital which is the seat of government and *Pattana* to a city which is the seat of trade and commerce. The last is characterised generally by the presence of a port.

Man, when tired of the din and bustle of city life, finds spiritual peace in a temple, and therefore construction of temple is a religious necessity even in a city. Gardens and groves, grown round the shrine contribute to mental health which is a sign of life's fulness. The qualifying expression '*manorama*' tells us in brief that the site selected for the temple should be one which is conducive to the growth and charm of the mind

Throughout the description of the site, here as well as in the subsequent stanzas, there is revealed a sense of panoramic variety and exuberance of nature's life.

With the statement of our author, the following lines may be compared :—

(1) [83] सिद्धायतनतीर्थेषु नदीनां सङ्गमेषु वा ।
क्षीरवृक्षसमीपे वा पुण्यस्थानेषु सर्वतः ॥
वने चोपवने ग्रामे यत्र वा रमते मनः ।
तत्र भूमिं परीक्षेत यथा वक्ष्यामि लक्षणम् ॥
etc., etc.

83. Śaivāgamanibandhana (A Ms. from Tripunithura), Paṭala XI, Bhūparigraha, stanzas 2 and 3.

(2) [84] पुण्यक्षेत्रनदीतीर्थपर्वताद्यन्विता मही ।
प्रयच्छत्यधिकां सिद्धिं यतस्तामाश्रयेद् बुधः ॥
etc. etc.

Following these general remarks, stanzas are found which deal in detail with the specific features of the land.

## STANZA 8

*" Prāci " etc.*

In the previous verse the author described in brief and in general terms the nature of the site to be selected for the temple of any God (Śiva, Viṣṇu etc.). Now, in this stanza, the author lays down the exact quarter in *Grāma, Pura* and *Pattana,* for the construction of a temple belonging to particular Gods like Śiva, Hari etc. According to the directions of the author, the North-West quarter is assigned to the temple of Śiva, western and eastern quarters to the temple of Hari, South-Eastern quarter to the temple of Gaṇapa and Ārya, North-Eastern to the temple of Durgā and northern to the temple of Subrahmaṇya. The central quarter may be allotted to all the Gods. Usually, the central quarter is preferred in a town, village or city, because it serves equally the convenience of the residents.

## STANZA 9

*" A Good Site."*

In this stanza, the author relates the general features of a good site, features which are conducive to the welfare of man and permanence of his structure. A good site should contain men and animals useful to man. It should abound in trees which are rich in juice and flowers and fruits. It must be even, devoid of ups and downs. Its dipping must be towards the east. This preference to an eastward slope is obviously based on a rational consideration. Such a direction is laid down with a view to enabling the residents to have the full benefit of the rays of the morning Sun. When the slope is towards the east, the morning rays would sweep across the whole area and purify the surroundings. In a temple, they would stream into *Garbhagṛha* to light up the image. Almost every treatise on architecture gives preference to the eastward dip. Its soil should be sticky to touch. Such soil reveals the quality of density

84. *Isānagurudevapaddhati,* (Vol. III, T. S. S. Ed.), Uttarārdha, 'Bhūlakṣaṇādhikāra,' Paṭala 23, stanza 23.

and glitter. It should produce a firm sound when beaten; in this case it indicates the solidity of the ground and a stable foundation can be safely laid on it. The site must be rich in water and preferably should have water running in a circumambulatory direction. It is believed that "'*pradakṣiṇa*' is an auspicious direction in which the sun moves across the sky."[85] The site should be abundant in soil. Loose and sandy land is unfit for the construction of any building, and therefore the site selected must be rich in soil. To know whether a land is rich or not in soil, the following process of examination is employed: Dig a pit one cubit deep and return the excavated soil back into the pit. The ground is declared to be the best, middling and worst type according as the soil at the top remains higher than the level, equal to the previous level or lower than the level.[86] The soil should be highly productive. When seeds are sown, they must quickly sprout up. The place should experience a climate which is neither too hot nor too cold; it must be moderate. Vitruvius the Roman writer on architecture also prescribes the same condition regarding the climate of a good site. He observes: "Its aspects should be neither violently hot nor intensely cold, but temperate in both respects.[87] The site which satisfies the above description in full is considered to be the best; that which has features opposite belongs to the worst type and that whose features are intermediate is of the middling kind.

The choice of a healthy situation for a building is a subject of paramount importance in a consideration of preliminary matters connected with the science of architecture. The emphasis on this subject as is found given by all architectural authorities in India is quite in keeping with sound architectural traditions prevailing here as elsewhere. Thus Vitruvius, the Roman author remarks: "The choice of a healthy situation is of the first importance; it should be on high ground, neither subject to fogs, nor rains; its aspects should be neither violently hot nor intensely cold, but temperate in both respects. The neighbourhood of a marshy place must be avoided."[88]

The description of the choice of a site on the basis of the contents thereof, the nature of the trees that grow there, the nature of the soil,

85. *A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilisation* by E. B. Havell, page 8.

86. Vide for direction texts like *Kāśyapaśilpa* (I, 37-38), (Ānandāśrama Series); *Mānasāra* (V, 34-37—Ācārya Edition); *Nibandhana* quoted at the end of the notes on this stanza.

87. Book I, Chapter IV (For quotation, vide P. K. Ācārya's Dictionary of Hindu Architecture, page 548).

88. Book I. Chapter II.

the dip of the land etc. is in agreement with the treatment of the same theme found in the works of other writers. For example compare our text with the following lines from the *Nibandhana* and *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* :—

1. The *Śaivāgamanibandhana* states[89] :—

रमन्ते यत्र गोमर्त्याः समा स्निग्धा च सा शुभा ।
यत्रोष्णकाले शीतत्वं उष्णस्पर्शा हिमागमे ।
वर्षासु चोभयस्पर्शा सा शुभा सर्ववर्णिनाम् ॥
हस्तमात्रं खनित्वा तु पांसुतोद्धृत्य पूरिता ।
मध्यमा चाधिका श्रेष्ठा साधमा या न पूरिता ॥
जलैः पूर्णा तथा ज्ञेया समारिक्तांगुलान्वितैः ।
तथा त्रिपञ्चसप्ताहैरुप्ता व्रीह्यादिरोपणैः ॥
पूर्वप्लवा मही श्रेष्ठा श्रीबलायुर्विवर्धिनी ।
सर्वसम्पत्करी पुंसां प्रासादस्य च भूतिदा ॥

2. The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* observes[90] :—

बहुपांसुरशुष्काम्बुः क्षिप्रं व्रीह्यादिरोहणा ।
प्रदक्षिणजला श्रेष्ठा समा शीतोष्णकालयोः ॥
नदी पूर्ववहा यत्र क्षीरपुष्पफलद्रुमाः ।
रमन्ते यत्र गोमर्त्याः समा स्निग्धा च सोत्तमा ॥
शङ्खाभ्रादिस्वरा चेष्टा सवर्णा सर्ववर्णिनाम् ।
अलाभे कृत्रिमैवं स्यादधमा स्यौदतोऽन्यथा ॥

These are the features in general of the site to be accepted. In the next stanza the general characteristics of the site to be rejected are stated.

## STANZA 10

*" A Bad Site "*

Features of a site which should be discarded are set forth in this verse in a general manner. They are described from external as well as internal points of view. According to the former, shape of the site and nature of the surface are considered, and according to the latter, the

89. *Śaivāgamanibandhana,* Paṭala XI, (A Ms. from Tripunithura).
90. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* (T. S. S. Ed.), Paṭala XII, stanzas 3, 4, 5.

contents that are revealed when the ground is broken up by a plough. A site which is circular, or crescent-like or triangular or pentagonal or hexagonal, or that which has the form of a trident or sieve or that which faces towards a corner is to be avoided. All this is from the point of view of shape. It should be noticed in this connection, that a hexagonal site which is rejected by the author of the *Tantrasamuccaya* is laid down by the *Mānasāra* as one that yields prosperity. Says the *Mānasāra* : षडश्रैश्च समायुक्ता सर्वसम्पद् पदाधरा.[91] The author of the *Tantrasamuccaya* seems to have based his statement on the authority of the *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*[92] and *Nibandhana*, where the hexagonal is condemned as inauspicious. Of all shapes that which is hailed as the best is the square[93] or rectangle. The next prescribed is the octagonal. This predilection of Indian architects for square, rectangular or octagonal shape is clearly revealed not only in architectural treatises, but in extant examples of structures themselves. From the point of view of the nature of the surface, a site which resembles a fish, the back of an elephant, tortoise, or a cow's head is tabooed. (A variant reading given in the text in the place of Kūrma is Kola, which means 'a boar'). The principle involved in the selection of the site from the point of view of its shape seems to be this that "what pleases the eye is always good and what does not please the eye is always bad."[94] In the eyes of Indian architectural authorities certain shapes, which are seen condemned above, appeared inauspicious for ground-planning. Whatever we may say concerning the prohibition of certain shapes, the predilection of Indians for square is born of the aesthetic reasoning of a very high order. "On the score of symmetry alone, the square holds higher rank,"[95] observes Birkhoff in "*Aesthetic Measure.*" The same author also remarks : "Corresponding to the degree of symmetry involved, we should expect to find the square to be the best in form, the rectangle excellent."[96]

Next, prohibition is considered from the stand-point of the internal features of the site. If, when the earth is ploughed, ashes, charcoal, husks, bones and hair and anthills and worms, come to sight, the site should be shunned. These things, by their inauspicious associations give indication of a site which probably suffered from destruction by fire

91. *Mānasāra* (P. K. Ācārya's Edition), Ch. IV, line 12.
92. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* (T. S. S. Ed.), Paṭala 12, stanza 12; *Nibandhana*, Paṭala XI.
93. For instance vide *Mayamata* (T. S. S. Edition), Chap. III, stanza 1.
94. Some Architectural Conventions . . . . . by K. R. Pisharoti (*Cul. Heri. Ser.*).
95. *Aesthetic Measure* by George Birkhoff, page 25.
96. *Ibid.*, page 24.

or other calamity, or they suggest that it was employed for the purpose of cremation or burial. In any case, the site which reveals inauspicious things is unfit for residence and building projects. If there are subterranean cavities in a site, it gives room for fear from poisonous creatures. In the presence of underground life and cavities, there is no sense of safety of person and permanence of structures. Hence the ground which has these objectionable features is directed to be avoided at all costs.

Choice of site is again based on the rise and dip of its surface. Sites which slope eastwards and northwards, known respectively by the terms Govīthi and Gajavīthi are considered to be auspicious. That which dips towards the centre is bad and is declared to be shunned. The subject of rises and slopings is dealt with in detail in the *Vāstuvidyā*,[97] *Gurudeva* etc.[98]

The observations made in the two verses are obviously scientific and rational. There is unfolded a fund of common-sense beneath every statement of the author regarding the features of the site to be preferred and rejected. It might be difficult and even impossible to select a site in strict accordance with the specific directions that are given in the subsequent stanzas concerning the site intended for the four castes having regard to the colour, odour, taste, size and contents of the soil. But such a difficulty is solved by these two stanzas which prescribe the land good or bad for all castes alike in conformity with scientific reasoning and aesthetic taste of a high order.

For comparison, the following lines may be quoted from the *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*[99] :—

स्वाते रात्र्युषितैः पुष्पैस्तथा ज्ञेया सितादिभिः ।
वल्मीकशर्करारन्ध्रतुषाङ्गारास्थिभस्मभिः ॥
केशकर्दमकीटैश्च संयुक्तां वर्जयेन्महीम् ।
धूम्रतारौक्ष्यदौर्गन्ध्यकाठिन्यैश्चाशुभा मही ॥
अदिक्स्था जलहीना च कुटिला द्विगुणायता ।
वृता पञ्चत्रिषट्कोणा चार्धचन्द्रा च शूर्पिका ॥

The Nibandhanakāra deals with the features in elaborate details and relates the consequences of the presence of each feature in Paṭala XI.

97. *Vāstuvidyā,* Chapter II.
98. *Gurudevapaddhati,* Uttarādha, Paṭala 23, stanzas 23, 24, 25.
*Manuṣyālayacandrikā,* Ch. I, stanzas 19, 20, 21.
99. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* (T. S. S. Edition), Paṭala XII, stanzas 10, 11, 12.

Compare also *Mayamata* (T. S. S. Edition), Chapter III, Stanzas 7, 8, 9 and 12; *Gurudevapaddhati* (T. S. S. Edition, Vol. III), Paṭala 23, stanzas 14, 15 and 16; *Mānasāra* (P. K. Ācārya Ed.), Chapter IV, lines 15, 16 and 19; *Vāstuvidyā* (T. S. S. Edition), Chapter II, Stanzas 36-39.

## STANZA 11

*Preferences of Site on the basis of qualities associated with occupations—a traditional view.*

Based upon the associations of caste, a convention has come into vogue according to which a site is assigned to each caste with reference to the nature of the grass that grows in the site, the shape of the ground, the colour, scent and taste of the soil. The present verse treats of this theme. Rām Rāz subjects this determining factor to criticism as follows: "but the principle on which these distinctions are founded is altogether nugatory. It signifies little whether the ground for the residence of a Brahmin be square or oblong, white or red, sweet or sour, provided that the situation is convenient and that it furnishes a firm bottom for laying the foundation."[100] It may be remarked here that, though from the standpoint of impersonal scientific consideration the principle is nugatory, from the *traditional point of view,* it is important. Architectural principles, here as elsewhere, were shaped by the particular demands of society, and in India, where distinctions of classes have entered into the fabric of society on the basis of vocational activity, the principle of preferences cannot but compel attention. In the determination of site, assignment was made with due regard to the special taste of each. The Brahmin needed a site in which ghee, flowers, and other objects most serviceable in sacrifices can be had in plenty, and a site was prescribed for him in which prevails an atmosphere most congenial to his living. *Preferences of site are founded on qualities associated with occupations* and they are observed in all writings which deal with the architecture of the Hindus. In the matter of prescription our author, like every other author, has only kept tune with the spirit of his times. The *Mayamata*[101] treats of colour, scent, taste, touch, form, etc., good for each class in Chapter II. The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*[102] prescribes the shape, colour, taste, scent and the nature of the grass that characterise the soil of each class. The *Gurudevapaddhati*[103] deals with the

100. *An Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus*, page 16.
101. *Mayamata*, Chapter II, stanzas 4-15.
102. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*, Chap. XII, stanzas 6, 7, 8, 15.
103. *Īśanagurudevapaddhati*, Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXIII, stanzas 17-22.

smell, grass, shape, colour and dip of the land. The *Mānasāra*[104] treats of the declivity of the site, colour, scent and taste of the soil and nature of the trees that grow there. The *Kāśyapaśilpa*[105] prescribes only the colour of the soil. The *Vāstuvidyā*[106] treats of declivity, grass and smell that belongs to the soil. In all the works we have referred to there is no note of disagreement concerning the prescription of site with regard to its colour, smell, taste etc. The classification being traditional in character, there is noticeable a certain uniformity and general agreement in the mode of treatment of this subject of preferences.

## STANZAS 12–15

*"The wick experiment."*

It is not always that one comes across an ideal site which satisfies all the requirements laid down in the above stanzas and in the stanzas that follow. When the site presents vague and mixed characteristics, the soil has to be further examined by means of some experiment. The three stanzas describe the process involved in the conduct of an experiment whose aim it is to determine the good or bad nature of the site examined. The test should be conducted as directed below: —

Make a pit a foot and a half in dimension and besmear the same with cow-dung solution. Let the Guru, facing the east, place therein an unburnt pot filled with paddy. On the top of the said pot, place an earthern pan which holds ghee and four wicks of prescribed colour white etc., representing the four classes, at the four cardinal points. Kindle the wicks and let them burn for an interval (of 48 minutes). If at the end of the period, all the wicks remain burning, the site is good for all; if all are extinguished it is bad for all. If any wick representing particular caste blazes, the site is good for that particular caste. The rule of preference here is purely a matter of faith and convention.

*"A hidden scientific idea in the wick experiment."*

Leaving aside the preferential side of the experiment, *the scientific side of it is a product of careful thought and observation*, for it reveals the soundness of the site for purposes of the establishment of life. The experiment enables us to detect the predominance of the gas that the earth from beneath sends out. To support life and cumbustion presence of oxygen is a permanent necessity. It is oxygen that sustains life and

104. *Mānasāra*, Chapter III, lines 15-29.
105. *Kāśyapaśilpa*, chapter I, stanza 39.
106. *Vāstuvidyā*, Chapter II, stanzas 26-30.

light, and it distinguishes itself in this respect from other gases and noxious odours which quench fire and end life on earth. Marsh-gas, for instance, is always apt to catch fire at the slightest instance of its contact with atmospheric air. A site which sends out from underground such explosive gas as the marsh-gas is definitely unsafe and injurious to living. The presence of such gas, if it exists, should therefore be detected before one starts to lay the foundation. The experiment is intended to discover the nature of the underground. If the lighted candles go out before the lapse of the prescribed time, the quenching may be taken as due to want of oxygen; for oxygen in this instance is soon devoured by those gases which are devoid of the property of oxygen. Richness of life in the world of both animals and plants suggests the abundance of oxygen in the site concerned, as it is oxygen, as we all know, that keeps animal life breathing. The underground experiment, according to which lights must remain burning, also indicates the dominance of oxygen in the area under experimentation, for it is oxygen again that keeps fire blazing and preserves it from getting extinguished. We, therefore, maintain that *beneath the canons of selection of a proper site, there runs a steady stream of reasoning and a consideration for the safety of life and permanence of building.* The experiments are intended to insure the life and property of every man and to free him from the fury of destructive elements.

The following lines from Gurudeva[107] may be compared with the statement of our author:—

धान्यपूर्णामकुम्भं तु निधायेष्ट्वास्य चोपरि ॥
आमे शरावे कुडुबं गव्यमाज्यं विनिक्षिपेत् ।
चतुर्दिक्षु क्षिपेद् वर्तीः शुद्धाः कार्पासवस्त्रजाः ॥
सितरक्तपीतकृष्णाश्चतस्रः समवर्तिताः ।
ऐन्द्रदक्षिणसौम्याप्यवर्त्यो विप्रादिकाः क्रमात् ॥
पुरुषाद्यैस्तु जातीयैर्युक्तास्तन्मन्त्रमन्त्रिताः ।
सङ्कल्प्य ज्वालयेद् दीपान् गन्धाद्यैः पूजयेदपि ॥
याममात्रावधिं कृत्वा सुलिप्ते भूतले न्यसेत् ।
यस्य वर्णस्य या वर्ती सा ज्वलन्ती सुखावहा ॥
निर्वापिता चेद् वर्ज्या स्याद् विमानकरणादिषु ।
ज्वलन्ति यदि सर्वास्ताः सर्ववर्णसुखावहाः ॥

107. *Īśānagurudevapaddhati,* Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXIII, stanzas 32-37.

The *Śaivāgamanibandhana*[108] prescribes the method as follows :—

गोमयेन समालिप्य मध्ये तत्र विधानवित् ।
आमकुम्भोपरिन्यस्तवर्धमानधृतोदरे ।
चतस्रश्च चतुर्दिक्षु पूर्वादारभ्य वर्तिकाः ।
सिताद्या क्रमशो ज्वाल्याः स्वस्वजात्यभिमन्त्रिताः ॥
एवं कृत्वा तु वास्तुज्ञः सुप्रच्छन्नं तु कारयेत् ।
निशि निर्वान्ति या वत्यस्तावताभशुभापहाः ॥
तिष्ठत्येका तु या तत्र ज्वलन्ती स्निग्धरूपिणी ।
तस्य वर्णस्य सा भूमिर्लक्षिताभ्या विचक्षणैः ॥
अथ सर्वा विशीर्णास्ताः पुनः प्रज्वलिता अपि ।
वर्जनीया तु सा नित्यं वस्तुदुष्टा धरा स्मृता ॥
अथ सर्वास्तु सुस्निग्धा प्रज्वलन्ती दिशो दश ।
वस्तुसङ्कीर्णकं नाम सर्वेषां सर्वकामदा ॥

The *Manuṣyālayacandrikā*[109] also describes this process of experimentation. On this subject, the *Mānasāra* and *Kāśyapaśilpa* are both silent. This *Śilparatna*,[110] as usual, quotes our author and he takes note of this experiment in Chapter III.

## STANZAS 16, 17, 18 & 19

In these verses is furnished a classification of sites into four categories called *Supadmā, Bhadrā, Pūrṇā* and *Dhūmrā*. In stanzas 9 and 10 (*Tantrasamuccaya*, Original Text—Chapter I, stanzas 30 and 31) the features of the good and bad site are briefly and in a general fashion stated. Here the author deals in detail with the contents of the site with special reference to the presence of particular trees. There is clear emphasis laid on the presence of certain species of trees. The treatment in this respect is meticulous and unfolds a subtle understanding of the wealth of the forest-world and a power to discriminate the different species of trees. The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* further classifies the trees into four categories according as they are internally woody, externally woody, not woody and all woody. The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* thus observes :—

108. An unpublished Ms., Paṭala XI.
109. *Manuṣyālayacandrikā*, Ch. I, verses 31, 32.
110. *Śilparatna*, chapter III, stanzas 16-17.

अन्तस्सारं बहिस्सारं निस्सारं सर्वसारकम् ।
चतुर्धा स्थावरम् .... .... .... ॥[111]

Then follows the classification of site into Supadmā etc. *Prayoga-mañjarī,*[112] *Nibandhana,*[113] *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*[114], *Gurudeva,*[115] *Śilparatna,*[116] all these are agreed on this four-fold classification of site into Supadmā, Bhadrā, Pūrṇā and Dhūmrā and the consequence of each site. The *Mānasāra,* which is elaborate and expansive in many matters, however, is silent on this subject of classification.

We might here, for the sake of comparison, quote the following five stanzas from the *Mañjarī,* which closely agree with our text[117] :—

*Mañjarī* :—

पूर्णा च पद्मा च तथैव भद्रा धूम्रा च भूमिर्विहिता चतुर्धा ।
वक्ष्ये च तासामपि लक्षणानि संक्षेपतो भूमिपरिग्रहार्थम् ॥
अङ्कोलैर्बकुलैरशोकतरुभिर्निम्बैस्तथा किंशुकैः
सङ्कीर्णा सह माधवीभिरर्विकैर्निष्पावकैः कोद्रवैः ।
पार्श्वस्था वसुधाधरस्य शिखरे संस्थापिता तस्य वा
शस्ता स्वल्प .... पूर्णा मही पुष्टिदा ॥
कर्पूरागरुनालिकेरतिलकैर्दर्भैकदम्बार्जुनै-
र्मल्लियैःक्रमुकैश्च चम्पकवनैः कुन्दोत्पलैः संवृता ।
निम्ना सौम्यदिशि प्रभूतसलिला पूर्वप्लवा ....
सङ्कीर्णा च तथैव केतकवनैश्शस्ता सुपद्मा मही ॥
अभ्याशे सरितांपतेरुपहिते नद्यास्तटे वा पुनः
प्राप्ता तीर्थजलाशयः फलतरुः .... वृता याज्ञिकैः ।

111. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,* Paṭala XII, 23², 24¹, (T. S. S. Ed.).

112. An unpublished Ms. (preserved in the Adyar Mss. Library), Paṭala II (Vasudhāparigraha), Kerala Character.

113. *Śaivāgamanibandhna,* an unpublished Ms. from Malabar (Paṭala XI).

114. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* (T. S. S. Edition), vide Paṭala XII, sts. 22 to 35.

115. *Īśānagurdevapaddhati* (Vol. III, T. S. S. Edition), Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXIII, stanzas 6 to 13.

116. *Śilparatna* (T. S. S. Edition) Chapter III, stanzas 5, 6, 7 and 8. These stanzas are quoted from the Tantrasamuccaya.

117. An unpublished Ms., Adyar Library.

वृक्षैः पश्चिमदिक्स्थितैः कुसुमितैर्गुल्मैर्लताभिर्वृता
क्षेत्रैर्दक्षिणसंस्थितैश्च सुखदा भद्रा मही कीर्तिता ॥
अर्कैर्वेणुविभीतकैः स्नुहियुतैः श्लेष्मातकैः पीलुभिः
सङ्कीर्णा च सशर्करा च कठिना गर्भान्विता सोषरा ।
गृध्रश्येनवराहवायसकुलैर्गोमायुभिश्चाकुला
कर्तुर्दुःखकरी शिवालयविधौ धूम्रा मही वर्जिता ॥

## STANZA 20

When the proper site has been pitched upon, the Ācārya should perform certain rites in connection with the clearance of the site. These rites are described next. The preceptor chants certain *Mantras* which are addressed to all evil spirits and snakes and other poisonous creatures that haunt or are resident in the place under observation. He announces that the site belongs to the God whose temple is going to be constructed there. He therefore urges all evil spirits that probably might be lurking there, to speedily remove themselves to far off regions. Then, he offers worship to the cutting instruments and cuts and clears the ground of its unwanted trees and creepers.

*Determination of Cardinal points.*

The site having been fixed with due regard to its qualities and having levelled it, the next most important step is the ascertainment of the true position of the cardinal points by means of a gnomon (*Śaṅku*). A correct and precise knowledge of the quarters is a necessity of first magnitude in giving the structure an auspicious aspect. A site which faces the intermediate points is condemned as inauspicious.[118] To prevent a building facing the corners and to give it proper orientation, cardinal points have to be ascertained. When the cardinal points have been determined, the ground found necessary for the structure must be measured. The next stanza,[119] which is an extract taken from the supplementary Paṭala describes the method to be adopted in finding the true East and West, North and South, in any place lying to the North or South of the Equator.

118. Vide the *Tantrasamuccaya* (Vol. I, T. S. S. Edition, chapter I, stanza 31), (in our adaptation, Part I, st. No. 10).

119. Vide the *Tantrasamuccaya* (Vol. II, T. S. S. Edition), Paṭala XII, stanza 2 (in our adaption, Part I, st. No. 21).

## STANZA 21

*Process of the Finding of Cardinal points.*

The direction contained in the text is simple. It is with reference to the land which is situated either to the north or south of the equator (*Akṣa*). Level the ground (in a *Sākṣadeśa*) and plant a gnomon at the centre, the gnomon being of 12 *aṅgulas* of length. Describe a circle round it with a radius more than its length (say double the length). During the course of the Sun from morning till evening, three points will be secured, two touching the circumference and one in the centre, the interval in the course of their marking being equal. The three points are obtained by marking the end of the shadow projected during three different times, the interval between them being equal. With these three points as the centre, draw three circles of the same radius. Two figures in the form of two fishes will be produced where the circles cut. The head and tail of each fish will lie in the North–South direction. Strike two nails at the points (*i.e.*, head and tail) of each fish and then extend two threads cutting through the central cord of the two fishes. At a certain point in the North (when the sun is in the South of the Equator) these two threads extended will meet. From this meeting point in the north extend another thread southwards till it joins the central point at the base of the gnomon. This thread which joins the northern point with the point at the base of the gnomon will give the North—South line. Having found the due North and South as described above, with the two points (*i.e.* meeting-points northern as well as southern) as centres two circles should be described. A figure in the form of a fish lying in the direction East–West will be obtained. Hold a thread joining the head and tail of this fish, and the due East and West will be known.

The method that is described in other texts like the *Mānasāra* is a little different. According to the *Mānasāra*, only two circles are to be drawn and consequently one fish will be secured while determining the North–South line. Our author describes in the wake of Gurudeva, who after having laid down the usual procedure[120] remarks that it is good so far as the land lying on the equator is concerned. As regards land lying to the North or South of the Equator, the method is different, and in this context he prescribes the method that we have observed just now.

120. *Īśānagurudevapaddhati* (Vol. III, T. S. S. Edition), Paṭala XXIV, stanzas 1 to 13.

Says Gurudeva[121] :—

निरक्षदेशे लङ्कादौ स्यादयं दिग्विनिर्णयः ।
इत्याहुः केचिदित्यस्मात् साक्षदेशस्य कथ्यते ॥
विशेषः साक्षदेशानामस्त्येवार्कापसर्पणात् ।
.... .... .... .... .... .... ॥
अथार्कावलम्बकैर्विनापि प्रकारान्तरेण ।
दिक्परिज्ञानार्थमुच्यते .... .... ॥
छाया त्रयाग्रोद्भववृत्तमध्यस्पृक्सूत्रयोर्यत्र युतिः प्रदेशे ।
याम्योत्तरा शङ्कुदिशा ककुप् स्यात् क्रमेण सौम्येतरगोलयोः स्यात् ॥

The author of the *Tantrasamuccaya* has followed the latter alternative. The subject of making of the gnomon and the principles to be followed in connection with the finding of the cardinal points have been more or less elaborately treated by every authority on architecture. Thus *Mayamata*,[122] *Kāśyapaśilpa*,[123] *Mānasāra*,[124] *Vāstuvidyā*,[125] *Manuṣyālayacandrikā*[126] and other architectural works, as well as astronomical and mathematical treatises such as the *Sūryasiddhānta* and *Līlāvatī*, all these do not fail to take note of the principles to be followed in determining the cardinal points by means of a gnomon.

## STANZA 22

*Peg-marking of the site.*

After ascertaining the quarters, the area required for the building of the temple must be peg-marked. This stanza prescribes the process involved in the fixing of the boundary-line. Nine pegs should be made out of a single tree called *'Punna'* (*Calophylam*). This tree is preferred because it is strong both externally and internally, and happens to be

121. *Īśānagurudevapaddhati*, Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXIV, stanzas 14-15.
122. *Mayamata* (T. S. S. Edition), chapter VI, 1-10.
123. *Kāśyapaśilpa* (Ānandāśrama Series), ch. I, 60-70.
124. *Mānasāra* (P. K. Ācārya's Edition), Ch. VI.
125. *Vāstuvidyā*, (T. S. S. Edition), Ch. III, 7-10.
126. *Manuṣyālayacandrikā*, Ch. II, 1-4.
Also vide Rām Rāz, *Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus*, pages 19 and 20; P. K. Ācārya's *Mānasāra*, Vol. III, Plate 2, figures 1 and 2; K. R. Pisharoti's 'Vāstuvidyā—Translation and critical notes,' figs. 1-5, (Calcutta Oriental Journal).

the best fitted for the making of pegs. The *Mānasāra* and *Mayamata*[127], offer some more alternatives such as *Khadira, Ādimīḍa, Madhūka,* all of which are milky and strong internally. The length (i.e. height) of the pegs, according to our author, should be one cubit and circumference one-fourth of a cubit (*i.e.* 6 aṅgulas). According to the *Mānasāra,* the length may be from 21 to 25 aṅgulas and circumference equal to the measure of a fist.[128] Pegs of this description having been made, they should be duly propitiated (*i.e. Mantras* should be chanted on them). The 'Guru' should then plant one peg at the centre of the plot and eight at the eight quarters on the boundary-line beginning with due East and ending with Īśāna quarter (*i.e.*, in the four sides East, West, North and South and in the four corners South-East etc.). When the pegs are posted as stated above, strings should be stretched forth and fastened round the posts twice and thus the area should be marked. The string that is referred to here is otherwise known as *Mānasūtra,* because it is used for measuring and marking the ground area. It is made of three cotton or silk threads which are thrice twisted.

A more or less similar description of peg-marking may be observed in the *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,*[129] *Gurudeva,*[130] *Mayamata*[131], *Mānasāra*[132] and *Nibandhana*[133].

The following lines from the *Śaivāgamanibandhana* may be compared with our text :—

महीी यत्र प्रशस्तोक्ता गन्धवर्णरसादिभिः ।
तत्र पुण्येऽथ नक्षत्रे कुर्यात् भूमिपरिग्रहम् ॥
ततो न्यस्य घटं मध्ये तुर्यै .... मङ्गलैः ।
सूत्रपातं चतुर्दिक्षु कुर्यात् पञ्चाक्षरेण तु ॥
ऐन्द्रादीशानपर्यन्तं शङ्कून् संस्थापयेत् क्रमात् ।
पुन्नामैकतरुद्भूतशङ्कवो निर्घृणा दृढा ॥
षडङ्गुलपरीणाहायामात्तु चतुर्गुणाः ।
अधोमूलोर्ध्वशाखास्तु चतुरस्राश्च वर्तुलाः ॥
प्राङ्मुखेणाष्टधा ताड्याः पूजिता लोहमुद्गरैः ॥

127. *Mānasāra,* chapter VI, lines 111, 112.
128. *Mayamata,* ch. VI, St. 16; *Mānasāra,* Ch. VI, lines 109, 110.
129. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,* Paṭala XII, 44.
130. *Īśānagurudevapaddhati,* Vol. III, Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXVI, 79 to 84, 88.
131. *Mayamata,* chapter VI, stanzas 16-20.
132. *Mānasāra,* chapter VI, lines 105-120.
133. An unpublished Ms. from Malabar, Paṭala XI, vide Extract.

Another topic that is closely dealt with by the several authors is the subject of ploughing the site. Preparatory to the laying of the foundation, the ground selected and peg-marked is required to be ploughed over thrice or five times. A description of the plough and oxen is given. In this respect some texts are more elaborate than others. Ploughing is accompanied by certain ceremonials, which are conducted by the *Ācārya*. In the plot furrowed seeds must be sown such as the kidney beans, sesamum and the like. When the crops are matured and flowers are in bloom, they should be grazed by cattle and the ground must be presented to Brahmins in order to get it sanctified and purified. This, in brief, constitutes the subject-matter of stanzas 55 to 58 in the *Tantrasamuccaya*.[134] The following stanza from the *Mañjarī* briefly deals with the subject that follows *'Karṣaṇa'* :—

भूयस्तत्र निधाय गोनिवसनं नीत्वा च संवत्सरं
मुद्गादीनि पुनश्च तत्र निवपेद्धान्यानि पूर्वक्रमात् ।
भूयस्तान्यथ भक्षयेच्च पशुभिः शुद्धे मुहूर्त्ते ततः
खात्वा शल्यविमोचितामतिदृढां भूयो विदाध्यान्महीम् ॥

The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*,[135] *Kāśyapaśilpa*,[136] *Mayamata*,[137] *Gurudeva*,[138] *Nibandhana*,[139] *Mānasāra*,[140] all these texts have treated this theme in a rather detailed manner.

## STANZA 23

*The Digging of the Foundation-Pit.*

In this stanza the author gives direction for the digging of the foundation-pit. The ground which has been prepared for the building of the temple, should be dug to the depth of a man's height (with uplifted arms) or till the rock or water comes to sight. Three-fourth of this pit must be filled with sand and stone and beaten with wooden piece resembling an elephant's foot.[141] The surface should be cleaned and purified according to the purificatory rites. A *Vedi* (altar) must

134. T. S. S. Edition, Vol. I, Paṭala I.
135. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*, Paṭala XII, 36-40.
136. *Kāśyapaśilpa*, chapter I, 43-59.
137. *Mayamata*, chapter IV, 4-10.
138. *Gurudevapaddhati*, Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXVI, 75-78.
139. *Nibandhana*, Paṭala XI, in 6 stanzas (unpublished Ms.).
140. *Mānasāra*, ch. V, lines 38-88.
141. *Mānasāra*, chapter XVIII, lines 6-8.

then be raised. *'Vedi'* was originally the altar prepared for Vedic sacrifices, but in course of time it was incorporated in the newly evolved system of Hinduism. Any seat raised to make room for the presentation of offerings also came to be known by the term *Vedi.* Here the altar referred to is intended for the conduct of *Vāstupūjā. 'Vāstu'* is the deity presiding over the structural area. He is worshipped when the night falls. Homage is paid to him at the *Īśāna* quarter of the purified *Vēdi.* This subject of digging of the pit and returning of the soil again into the pit till three fourth of it is filled and the paving of its surface and preparing of altar for sacrifice is more or less similarly treated by architectural authorities and instances may be cited from the *Gurudeva,*[142] *Kāśyapa,*[143] *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,*[144] *Mānasāra*[145] and the like.

The following lines from *Gurudeva* (*uttarārdha,* xxvii, stanzas 40–45) may be cited in support of our author's statement :—

ततः प्रासादसीमान्तं स्थलं यत् तदशेषतः ॥
उद्बाहुनरमात्रं तु खात्वोद्धृत्य त्यथेन्मृदम् ।
जलान्तं शर्करान्तं वा खानयेदिति केचन ॥

अथ प्रतिष्ठापद्धतौ—

"शर्करान्तं जलान्तं वा खानयेद् देवसद्मनि ।
पुरुषार्धं गृहे वाथ यावद् भूमिर्विशुध्यति ॥"

इति ।

खातं सम्प्रोक्ष्य चास्त्रेण पूर्वमष्टाङ्गुलं मृदा ।
लोष्टाद्यदुष्टयापूर्य शुद्धया चाविवर्णया ॥
ततस्तु वृत्तपाषाणैर्मृज्जलान्तरितं क्रमात् ।
हस्तप्रमाणमास्तीर्य सिकताभिर्मृदा पुनः ॥
आप्लाव्य सलिलेनाथ गजैराक्रामयेत् स्थलम् ।
प्रशस्ततरुसम्भूतैर्हस्तिपादैर्दृढैः समम् ॥
आकोट्याघर्षयेच्चैव सुदृढं चिनुयात् स्थलम् ।
वेदांशशेषिते खाते स्थापयेत् प्रथमेष्टकाम् ॥

142. *Gurudevapaddhati,* Pāṭala XXVII, 40-45 (Uttarārdha).
143. *Kāśyapaśilpa,* chapter IV, 6-16.
144. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,* Paṭala XII, 45, etc.
145. *Mānasāra,* chapter XVIII, lines 6-9.

*"The Fifty-three deities that preside over the ground."*

The ground selected for building is traditionally divided into certain number of plots and each plot is assigned to a deity, who is supposed to preside over that plot. In stanzas from 60 to 70 the author furnishes the names of these several deities and their position in the ground plan. There are altogether 53 deities referred to. Brahmā occupies the central plot. Immediately surrounding this, starting from due East and ending with Īśa (North-East) there are twelve lords presiding over twelve plots and their names are Aryaka, Sāvitra, Savitā, Vivasvān, Indrajit, Indra, Mitra, Rudrajit Rudra, Mahīdhara, Āpavatsa and Āpa. In the external four wings on the four sides consisting of thirty-two plots beginning with Īśāna in the right-hand direction, there are thirty-two deities, whose names in order are Īśāna, Parjanya, Jayanta, Indra, Sūrya, Satya, Bhṛśa, Antarikṣa, Vahni, Pūṣan, Vitatha, Gṛhakṣata, Yama, Gandharva, Bhṛṅgarāja, Mṛga, Pitaras, Dauvārika, Sugrīva, Puṣpadanta, Varuṇa, Asura, Śoṣa, Roga, Vāyu, Nāga, Mukhya, Bhallāṭa, Soma, Argala, Diti and Uditi. Outside these, on the four sides, there are, beginning with East four demons Sarvaskanda, Aryama, Jambhaka and Pilipiñcaka and in the four external corners beginning with South-East four demonesses called Carakī, Vidārī, Pūtanā and Pāparākṣasī. Gods and semi-gods, spirits and goblins, demons and demonesses—all these together constitute the number fifty-three. This theme of division of the ground into several plots, assignment of these plots to deities referred to above, and the performance of sacrificial functions connected therewith, all these matters are found observed in every treatise on architecture in connection with preliminaries bearing on architectural activities. The division of the whole ground into several parts is considered important in view of the fact that it later serves as a guiding factor in the proper and auspicious disposition of the various members of the structure.

*"Vegetarian nature of offerings, a distinctive feature of the Tantra-samuccaya treatment."*

Coming to the ritualistic side, it will be noted that oblation of food and offerings consisting of different articles are extended to the several deities, in the prescribed manner. According to our author, the ceremonial is to be conducted by the Guru, who, as we have already noticed, is a Brahmin. Here there is an interesting point which attracts our attention. According to the *Mānasāra* and several other works the leading part in the sacrifice is assigned to the '*Sthapati*' and among offerings which fall in the province of Sthapati's priestly function, mention is made of meat, fishes and blood of animals. These articles are ordered to be offered to demons and demonesses and such other spirits. In our text, on the other hand, the treatment in this connection takes an altogether

20

different turn. There is no reference at all made to non-vegetarian articles in the list of objects prescribed for offerings. The oblation is purely vegetarian in character and it is conducted by the Ācārya, who is a Brahmin and who by virtue of his Brahminhood shuns articles that are non-vegetarian. The two stanzas which are quoted below will amplify the point we have observed above.

States the author[146] :—

कुशप्रसूनाक्षतवारिहव्यैस्त्रिशः किरेद् वास्तु चतुर्मुखाभ्याम् ।
सकृत् सकृत् तत्परितः परेभ्यो बहिर्ग्रहेभ्योऽञ्चितपञ्चकूरैः ॥
कृत्वा बलिं सलिलमत्र सकृत् सकृच्च दत्त्वा प्रसन्नयजनं प्रविधाय धातुः ।
तद्वास्तुदैवतकदम्बकृतावलम्बं प्राकारमध्यमवबुध्य करोतु रक्षाम् ॥

Similar are the articles referred to in the Viṣṇu Saṁhitā.[147]

## STANZAS 24-25

*" Nidhikumbha and Ādhāraśilā."*

In the foundation-pit which has been prepared according to the rites above described is to be laid the *Ādhāraśilā,* the foundation-stone. This stone will be a square, one having a breadth which is half that of the *Śrīpīṭha* and thickness (*i.e.,* height) half of its breadth. Thus the *Śilparatna* observes[148] :—

पीठस्य तारार्धततां तदर्धविस्तारयुक्तां प्रकरोतु मन्त्री ।
वा पादपद्मस्य ततां तदर्धतुङ्गामथाधारशिलां सुलग्ने ॥

This *Ādhāraśilā* will have a low space in its centre which will be filled with grains. Over the seat of grains will be placed, according to rites, the *Nidhikalaśa,* the sacred pot which is so called because of its contents which are precious articles, stones, gold and other valuable things. It is made of copper or stone. At the mouth of the *Kalaśa* must be imagined the figure of a lotus, and in a meditative mood should be invoked therein the Goddess Śakti.

146. *Tantrasamuccaya,* Vol. I, Paṭala I, stanzas 72, 73.

147. *Vishṣṇusamhitā,* Paṭala XII, 51 : कुशपुष्पाक्षतान्नाद्भिर्गन्धपुष्पैः प्रपूजयेत् ॥

148. *Śilparatna,* chapter X, 7½.

She is addressed the following *mantra* :

त्वमेव परमा शक्तिस्त्वमेवासनधारिका ।
सन्तृप्तया त्वया देवि ! स्थातव्यमिह सर्वदा ॥[149]

Then over the *Nidhikalaśa* should be placed ceremoniously a *Śilāpadma* (Lotus made of stone). Throughout the history of Indian ritual, jar and lotus have figured as objects of symbolic significance. Sacrificial jar, for instance, is regarded as the jar of nectar, the jar of the elixir of immortality. The lotus is held as the symbol of Universal creation. the fruit inside as the womb of the universe. It is traditionally associated with the seat of Lakṣmī and in architecture often employed as the pedestal of a structure. Then, towards the right side in the seat of grains, must be placed a *Śilākūrma* (tortoise of stone). Lord Viṣṇu in his incarnation in the form of tortoise must then be invoked in the Kūrma and should be addressed thus :—

नमस्ते कूर्मरूपाय विष्णवे विश्वधारिणे ।
करिष्यमाणं प्रासादमिह त्वं धर्तुमर्हसि ॥[150]

After having addressed the above prayer, over the *Kūrma* should be placed the *Yoganāla* made of copper, in the prescribed manner and it should be so situated that it should reach the '*janman*' or plinth of the structure. The pit should then be filled with sand and stone and beaten well till its surface becomes firm and stable. Observes the author in verse half :—

कूर्मस्योपरि योगनालमुपधायाजन्मभूम्युद्गतम् ।
गर्तं मृत्तिकयाभिपूर्य दृषदा चाकोट्यदार्ढ्यं नयेत् ॥[151]

The dimension of the *Nidhikumbha, Padma, Kūrma* and *Yoganāla* is furnished in a stanza[152] which appears in the supplementary Paṭala. For proportion *vide* stanza and its translation No. 25. In stanza No. 24, the reading of the last line is adopted from a Malayālam edition of the text *Tantrasamuccaya*.

149. *Tantrasamuccaya* (T. S. S. Edition), Paṭala I, stanza 75.
150. *Ibid.*, stanza 79 .
151. *Tantrasamuccaya* (T. S. S. Edition), Vol. I, Paṭala I, stanza 80.
152. *Ibid.*, Paṭala XII, stanza 3.

## STANZAS 26-27

*The Making of Bricks and Garbhapātra.*

The next ceremonial that is dealt with is the making of bricks and *Garbhapātra* and their disposition. Stanzas numbered 26 and 27 in our selection occur in the supplementary Paṭala XII.[153] Bricks must be made of clay or stone. In the former case they must be kiln-burnt. According to Kāśyapa, bricks are of three kinds, made of the materials mud, stone or wood. The first should be employed in brick structure, the second in stone-structure and the third in wooden structure.[154] The dimension as laid down in our text is as follows :—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Length=8, 10 or 12 Aṅgulas.<br>Breadth=½ L.<br>Thickness = ¼ L. | or | Length=12 Aṅgulas.<br>Breadth=8 Aṅgulas.<br>Thickness=4 Aṅgulas. |

Bricks of this size should be made and they may be 12 or 8 or 4 according to the size of the structure.

The proportion here given is supported by the following references from Gurudeva and other authorities. Thus Gurudeva observes[155] :—

"अङ्गुलैः सङ्ख्यया दीर्घा जगतीपङ्क्त्यनुष्टुभाम् ।
क्रमात् तदर्धविस्तारा विस्तारार्धसमुच्छ्रयाः ॥
उत्तमादिविमानानां निर्दिष्टाः प्रथमेष्टकाः ।"

And the Pāśupata states :—

आयामतस्तालमात्रास्तारतोऽष्टाङ्गुलाः क्रमात् ।
अष्टौ सङ्कल्पयेदेवमुत्सेधाश्चतुरङ्गुलाः ॥
चतस्रोऽष्टौ द्वादश वा प्रादक्षिण्येन विन्यसेत् ।[156]

The dimension of the Garbhapātra which is to be placed at the centre of the pit formed in the middle of the bricks laid, is next prescribed.

Its length and breadth=$\frac{1}{12}$th of the height of the Pillar.

Its height=½ its Vyāsa.

Thickness (lit-Height) of lid.=½ the height of the *Garbhapātra.*

153. *Tantrasamuccaya*, Vol. II (T. S. S. Edition), Paṭala XII, 4 and 5.
154. *Kāśyapaśilpa* (Ānandāśrama Series), Ch. IV, 18.
Also vide Śilparatna, chap. X, 14 to 16 (T. S. S. Ed.).
155. *Gurudevapaddhati*, Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXVII, 67-68.
156. Pāśupata, etc., quoted from the Commentary *Vimarśinī*.

This *Garbhapātra* is square in shape and is to be made of copper. This description of the *Garbhapātra* furnished in our text is as given in *Kriyāsāra Vaiṣṇava.* Compare the following lines therefrom :—

"चतुरश्रं तदर्धोच्चं शोधयेत् तद् यथाविधि ।
सुगुप्तं तद् यथा भित्तौ भित्तिमानेन वा भवेत ॥
भित्तिस्तम्भचतुर्भागत्रिभागैकं तु तद्विदुः ।"[157]

## STANZA 28

*The Disposition of First Bricks.*

The plot for the lay out of bricks is specified in this stanza. It is on the right hand side of the door-frame, beneath the door-posts. It will be inside the *Pāduka* of the structure under construction. This plot should be paved well and purified according to rites and measured for the lay out of bricks. This prescription is supported by other authorities on the subject as well. Thus Gurudeva observes[158]:—

द्वाराद् दक्षिणतस्तस्मादन्तरा भुजवंशयोः ।
पादावशिष्टे खाते तु स्थापयेत् प्रथमेष्टकाः ॥

The *Nibandhana*[159] states :—

द्वारस्य दक्षिणे भागे कर्तव्या प्रथमेष्टका ॥

Similarly *vide Kāśyapa,*[160] and *Mānasāra.*[161]

## STANZA 29

This stanza gives the direction for the lay of bricks,[162] with respect to a square of four *Pādas* or quarters, *Vāyu, Īśa, Agni* and *Nirṛti.* With a nail, prepared out of the Peepal tree, should be drawn lines inside the

157. Vide *Vimarśinī* under stanza 5 in Paṭala XII, *Trantrasamuccaya* (T. S. S. Edition).
158. *Gurudevapaddhati,* Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXVII, 63.
159. *Śaivāgamanibandhana* (A Ms.), Paṭala on Vāstuvidhi.
160. *Kāśyapaśilpa,* Paṭala IV, st. 45 (Ānandāśrama Series).
161. *Mānasāra* XII, lines 196-206 (P. K. Ācārya ed.).
162. For similar treatment vide *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,* Paṭala XIII, 13-17.

square to indicate the quarters and the direction of the bricks that are to be placed therein. In the *Vāyu* and *Agni* quarters the position of the bricks will be in the direction pointing towards the East, and in *Īśāna* and *Nirṛti* towards the North. In a *Prāsāda* belonging to the three cubits measure type the square intended for the lay of bricks will be one cubit and four aṅgulas. When eight bricks of the measure of 12 aṅgulas of length, 8 aṅgulas of breadth and 4 aṅgulas of thickness are placed in the square in order, according to the direction laid down in the present verse, there will be left in the centre a square spot of 4 aṅgulas measure. This central plot will constitute the pit intended for the placing of the *Garbhapātra,* which forms the subject-matter of the next stanza. This idea is set forth by *Śaṅkara* in the following lines:—

अयं भावः—त्रिकरवर्गभवे प्रासादे चतुरङ्गुलाधिककरमानेन समचतुरश्रं क्षेत्रं कृत्वा 'यद्वार्काहियुगैर्मितातततिवितत्युत्सेधवत्योऽङ्गुलैरि'ति कर्मशेषे वक्ष्यमाणरीत्या द्वादशाङ्गुलदीर्घा अष्टाङ्गुलविस्तृताश्चतुरङ्गुलोत्सेधाश्चाष्टेष्टका ईशवाय्वोः पूर्वापरायता इतरयोरन्यथारूपाश्च स्थाप्याः । तथा सति मध्ये चतुरङ्गुलसमविस्तारस्य गर्भपात्रस्य गर्तं भवतीति ॥[163]

Bricks should be so arranged that they must leave low space in the centre for the disposition of he *Garbhapātra* as directed in the rule that is laid down below.

## STANZA 30

*The place of Garbhapātra.*

The exact place of the *Garbhanyāsa* is here referred to. In the case of any God, the *vistāra* of the internal wall should be divided by 8. In the part fifth from outside and fourth from inside will constitute the place for *Garbhanyāsa.* In the case of a temple of Viṣṇu, the division is by 9, and the location of the *Garbhapātra* will be in the seventh part from outside and third part from inside. In the case of Ṣāṇmātura (*i.e.,* Subrahmaṇya), the *Garbhapātra* will be situated in the fourth part from outside and second part from inside, the division of the wall here being by five. If he *Yajamāna,* the man for whose use the temple is being built, happens to be a Brahmin, the *Garbha* will be placed on the *Pāduka* if Kṣatriya on the level, if others, beneath the level in order. This prescription is supported by many authorities[164] whose statements we shall furnish below :—

163. *Tantrasamuccaya,* Vimarśinī under stanza 90, Paṭala I (T. S. S. Edition.)
164. a, b, c, d, e and f. Quotations from *Vimarśinī* under T. S. XII, 6.

Thus the Pāśupata observes :—

(a) " आरूढभित्तिविस्तारमष्टधा विभजेत् पुनः ।
बाह्येऽत्र चतुरो भागानन्तर्भागत्रयं त्यजेत् ॥
तन्मध्ये स्थापयेद् गर्भं गर्ते प्रासादमानतः ।"

The *Mañjarī* states :—

(b) " तद्भित्तिविस्तारमथाष्टभागं कृत्वाथ बाह्ये चतुरोऽत्र भागान् ।
त्रिभागमभ्यन्तरतो विहाय तत्रान्तरे गर्भमथो न्यसेच्च ॥"

The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* says :—

(c) " द्वारस्य दक्षिणे भागे त्रतीयांशे द्विशेषिते ।
गोमूत्रेणाप्लुते न्यस्येद् द्वारमूलस्य पार्श्वतः ॥"

The *Skandasaṃhitā* states :—

(d) " भित्तिं तु पञ्चधा भङ्क्त्वा त्रीणि बाह्ये परित्यजेत् ।
अन्तरेकं तु तन्मध्ये .... .... .... ॥"

(e) " पादुकोपरि विप्राणां नृपतेस्तत् समं भवेत् ।
अधस्ताद् वैश्यशूद्राणां .... .... ॥

Gurudeva similarly observes in 'Garbhanyāsādhikāra' :—

(f) अथ गर्भस्य विन्यासं कुर्यादायतनादिषु ।
बीजभूतो हि यस्तस्य प्रकृतिश्च समृद्धिदः ॥
इन्द्रपावकयोर्मध्ये द्वाराद् दक्षिणतो भुवि ।
कुर्वीरन् गर्भविन्यासं सर्वे वर्णाः समृद्धये ॥
प्रतेरुपरि विप्राणामुपानोपरि भूभुजाम् ।
विशां चाथ चतुर्थानां भूमावित्यपि केचन ॥
दृढां ताम्रमयीं फेळां कुर्याद् गर्भस्य भाजनम् ।

*The Garbhādhāna ceremonial with reference to structure.*

The ritual bearing on *Garbhavinyāsa*, which constitutes the theme of verses 91 to 106,[165] has special and symbolical significance. In the pit formed at the centre of bricks are placed earth, roots, seeds, grains,

165. *Tantrasamuccaya*, Paṭala I, 91-106.

gems and metals.[166] A sacrifice[167] is performed and later the pit is cleared of the various articles deposited therein and it is purified according to rites. On the altar in the pit, Śakti or the Mother Goddess conceived as Energy, is invoked and worshipped. The 'Guru' holds the *Garbhapātra* in both hands and, facing the East, pronounces hundred times sacred syllables referring to the deity. On an auspicious moment, with the approval of the twice-born and to the accompaniment of holy sounds, the 'Guru' meditates on the *Garbhapātra* and conceives in it creative energy, the source of universal production. At night, in the pit conceived as the womb of the Mother Earth, is deposited the *Garbhapātra* gradually and to the accompaniment of the recitals of prayer-formulas. Mother Earth, the supporter and preserver of all beings, the most propitious and lovely, who has for bosoms the lofty and snow-clad mountains and for robes and garments the rivers and the oceans is besought in the most endearing manner to bear and to bring into being the person (*puruṣa*) of the *Prāsāda* (temple) strong and endowed with the best of qualities. Among the preliminary activities which precede construction proper, *Garbhavinyāsa* constitutes the final ceremony. After the completion of this ceremony follows the construction of the temple by artisans.

In the conception of Indian authors, architecture is the transcription of the body's state into the form of building. The symbolism of the ritual bearing on *Garbhavinyāsa* together with the nature of nomenclature revealed in architectural literature echoes the notion of bodily function. 'Prāsāda' is conceived as a *Puruṣa* (Person) and the *Garbhādhāna* ceremony which governs the life of a Hindu while in the stage of conception is supposed to govern the structure (temple) in its incipient state of construction. The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* emphasises the importance of the execution of the *Garbhavainyāsa*. It observes :—

गर्भाधानं ततः कुर्यान्नागर्भे धाम्नि सम्पदः ॥[168]

After having described the rites connected with the Homa, Nārāyaṇa, the author of the *Tantrasamuccaya*, directs the *Garbhavinyāsa* to be performed in the manner we have observed. The following are the stanzas which describe the process in its final stage;

हत्वेष्टकागर्तगतं मृदाद्यं संशोध्य गव्यादिसमाप्लुतेऽत्र ।
सविष्टरेऽभ्यर्चितयोगपीठे शक्तिं समावाह्य निजां यजेत ॥

166. *Ibid.*, 98.
167. *Ibid.*, 96-100.
168. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā*, XIII, 22.

प्राज्ञाज्ञातः पिधानोत्तरमखिलजगद्गर्भि तद्गर्भपात्रं
तिष्ठन् कृत्वाञ्जलौ तत्तदणुशतजपं मन्त्रवित् संविधाय ।
गर्भीयन्तीं जगन्मण्डलमखिलमनुध्याय शक्तिं स्वयं त-
द्गर्भाकारेऽत्र गर्ते न्यसतु निशि शनैः स्वोक्तमन्त्र प्रजापी ॥
सर्वभूतालये ! भद्रे ! सागराम्बरभूषिते !
उत्तुङ्गाद्रिस्तनभरे ! देवि ! गर्भं समाश्रय ॥
प्रासादपूरुषतया परिणामिनीह
मूलेन देवमभिवाह्य समर्च्य गर्भे ।
किंचिन्निवेद्य परितोष्य सुरक्ष्य तक्ष्णा
प्रासादमारचयतां सहमन्त्रबिम्बम् ॥[169]

The *Viṣṇusaṃhitā* similarly observes[170] :—

आज्यं समर्प्य तत् पात्रं विधायाग्रकरस्थितम् ।
जप्त्वा मन्त्रं भुवं ध्यात्वा प्राङ्मुखो निशि देशिकः ॥
सुमुहूर्ते द्विजानुज्ञां प्राप्य तूर्यादिनिस्वनैः ।
शक्तिं ध्यात्वार्चयित्वास्यां गर्भभूतमिदं स्मरन् ॥
ब्रह्माण्डं पार्थिवं शुभ्रं गृहमूर्तिप्रसूतये ।
ध्यात्वास्मिन् पूर्ववच्चोर्वीं शनैर्मन्त्रमुदीरयेत् ॥
सर्वभूतधरे ! कान्ते ! पर्वतस्तनमण्डिते ।
समुद्रपरिधाने ! त्वं देवि ! गर्भं समाश्रय ॥

Gurudeva[171] also deals with these topics in the same strain. The author of the *Mañjarī* concludes the ritual with the following stanza :

उच्चार्यैवमिमं च मन्त्रमसकृद् ध्यात्वा महीमण्डलं
गोमूत्रेण परिप्लुते तु विधिवद् गर्भं निधायावटे ।
गर्भाधानमिमं प्रकल्प्य विधिवत् सन्तोष्य वित्तैर्गुरुं
प्रासादं सुदृढं च लक्षणयुतं कुर्यात्ततः शिल्पिभिः ॥

169. *Tantrasamuccaya,* Paṭala I, 101, 102, 105, 106.
170. *Viṣṇusaṃhitā,* XIII, 40-43.
171. *Īśānagurudevapaddhati,* Uttarārdha, Paṭala XXVII, 100-105.

.References to Earth as Mother and Supporter of beings may be met with in the *Ṛgveda* and *Atharvaveda*[172] : —

With an enumeration of the main topics dealt with in the First Paṭala, the author concludes the preliminary section. The following is the concluding verse: —

इति तन्त्रसमुच्चयेऽर्चकोर्वीग्रहवास्त्विष्टिनिधोष्टकाक्रियाढ्यः ।
सहगर्भशिलाहृतिप्रकारः प्रथमोऽयं पटलः प्रगुम्फितोऽभूत् ॥[173]

172. *Ṛgveda*, X, 18, 10 and 11; *Atharvaveda* XII, 1, 10, 11, 15, 22 and 63.
173. *Tantrasamuccaya*, Paṭala I, stanza 121.

# The Nayaks of Tanjore

By

V. Vridhagirisan, M.A., M.Litt.

Edited with Introduction and Notes

by

C. S. Srinivasachari, M.A.

## CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

The rule of the Nayaks of Tanjore which comprises roughly a period of about a hundred and fifty years from the second quarter of the 16th century down to the third quarter of the 17th century, has not hitherto received sufficient attention at the hands of historians. The Nayaks of Tanjore who started their rule first as loyal feudatories under the patronage and authority of the mighty Vijayanagara Emperors, grew in course of time to be independent of the suzerain power; but they were never disloyal to their overlords as they were related to the Imperial house and it was only during the time of the last ruler that Tanjore lagged behind in extending her helping hand to the kings of Vijayanagar. Even this was largely due to her own internal weakness and degeneration. The Nayak rule came into existence when the suzerain power was in its palmy days and declined, undergoing all the vicissitudes of fortune so much characteristic of almost all our ancient dynasties. Unlike other dynasties that rose and fell and whose memory and achievements have become past history, the Nayaks have left deep and indelible marks of their rule and benevolence behind, and such monuments still remind the on-looker that their age was after all not far removed in tempo and culture from the modern times. The Chola country and its capital, Tanjore, became the centre of all their activities and it may be said that the period of their rule formed the connecting link between the epoch of Chola rule and the intrusion of foreign powers into the land. Thus the land after the decline of its indigenous Tamil rulers, passed on under the sway of Telugu chiefs coming from the north and after them of Marathas, before it came to be absorbed in the British dominion in the beginning of the 19th century.

Mr. J. H. Nelson (of the Madras Civil Service and author of *The Madura District, A Manual*: 1868) was the first writer to devote some attention to the rule of the Tanjore Nayaks in his well-known work; but his account is meagre and far from satisfactory. He had indeed made a careful study of the Tamil and Telugu chronicles besides the epigraphs then available and had also brought to bear upon his work foreign evidence contained in the letters of the Jesuits and other writers who had come to visit the land from as early as the 16th century. But Tanjore received only a passing and necessarily secondary consideration in his narrative as he was concerned mainly with the history of Madura; and so reference to Tanjore and its affairs was made only wherever and

whenever she came into contact with Madura and her politics. However meagre the information might be, yet it contains a good account of one phase of the history of Tanjore under the Nayaks and furnishes a picture drawn with critical historical judgment based on historical facts. Moreover, his treatment served as the basis for others who followed him. 'The History of the Tanjore Nayaks' in Tamil by Mr. T. S. Kuppuswamy Sastri (1903) was the next attempt made to present a connected account of their work. But it was not meant to serve as an elaborate and exhaustive account and so it remains a meagre narrative based upon Nelson and some indigenous chronicles and accounts available in the Tanjore Palace Library. *The Tanjore Manual* by Mr. T. Venkasami Rao (1883) contains some information about the Nayaks; but much of the matter embodied in it is only an annotated version of what is contained in Mr. Nelson's and Dr. Caldwell's works (*The Madura Country, A Manual* and *A History of Tinnevelly*). The account given in the *Tanjore Gazetter* by Mr. Hemingway (1906) is largely based upon Nelson and Mr. Kuppuswamy Sastri with reference to the history of the period of the Nayak rule. 'The History of the Nayaks of Madura (1924)' by Prof. R. Sathianatha Aiyar, the 'Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara' (1929) by the Rev. Father Henry Heras, S. J., and the 'Tanjore Andhra Nayaka Charitam' (1932) by Kuruganti Sitaramayya Garu are more recent publications; they embody valuable information regarding the Tanjore Nayaks; and their treatment bears ample testimony to the fruit of modern historical scholarship and criticism bearing on South Indian History in the 16th and 17th centuries. The greater portion of the available and necessary information pertaining to these Nayaks has been carefully collected, collated and made use of by them; but they are not unanimous in their views about affairs and in the sequence of events. Thanks are due to the indefatigable energy of the first two of the above mentioned scholars for their great service in getting translations from the French, of the contemporary Jesuit letters contained in 'La Mission de Madurē' and also the originals of the important letters written in the Portuguese language. Father Heras gives us valuable additional information as a result of his wide and intensive study of the letters of of the Jesuit missionaries. Mr. Sitaramayya's book in Telugu presents a connected account of the rulers of the dynasty; the author has studied carefully the available Telugu sources and made a good use of them. A historian needs to be dispassionate and disinterested in his treatment of historical material. This golden rule seems, however, to have been kept out of view by the author in his treatment of the dynasty generally and of the last Nayak in particular, when he grows extravagantly eloquent on the moral and ethical fruits of his reign and activity. Besides, the author's own parochial views are allowed full and

free play. His conclusions are based only on Telugu sources and a few inscriptions and the category of foreign evidence has been largely ignored by him.

*Sources.*—The principal material for the history of the Tanjore Nayaks falls under two broad divisions, *viz.*, literary and epigraphical. Under the former we have the native chronicles and memoirs, most of which are however not strictly contemporary, but belong to later times. They contain the local traditions current at the time of their composition. The manuscripts collected by Colonel Colin Mackenzie (studied and classified in William Taylor's 'Oriental Historical Manuscripts' 1835, and his 'Catalogue Raisonnée of Oriental Manuscripts' in three volumes published in 1857, 1860 and 1862) belong to this category and supply us with varied information besides historical facts. The compilers of many of these chronicles did not display the necessary degree of discrimination in sifting the information obtained; and so they contain both historical as well as non-historical, and sometimes unreliable, details and accounts. However, their usefulness in some particulars cannot be ignored or underrated, as they form the main source of our history, especially for the 16th century, and are really helpful, in those places where other evidence is not available. A careful examination of these chronicles will afford a quantum of valuable facts and will certainly help the student; but he should proceed very cautiously in deducing conclusions from them. The 'Karnātaka Rājākkaḷ Śavistāra Charitam' composed under the direction of Col. William MacLeod early in 1803, by Narayan finds a place among these chronicles and can be instanced as a specimen of the more valuable class among them. The accuracy of these writings is obvious when they are corroborated by other sources of evidence. The *Tanjāvūri Andhra Rājulu Charitamu* and the *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitam* (which contains in the main the same matter) belong, likewise, to this category of chronicles as they are not strictly contemporary to the events they portray. But these records are indispensable to the historian of the 16th century, as they give us a fairly connected account of the foundation of the Madura and Tanjore Nayakships. But their historical evaluation needs some corrective and the help of other evidence for balancing and modifying. Only facts common to them and other sources of information may be accepted by a process of searching internal and external criticism. These chronicles invest the bones of bare historical facts with a superfluity of flesh accretion, and fill up the gaps in our knowledge usefully in many points.

Besides these indigenous chronicles, we have a volume of literary evidence which is at once contemporary and native. Tanjore is particularly fortunate in possessing this kind of material in an abundant

measure as the fruit of the enlightened literary patronage of the Nayak rulers. The importance of these works for the study of Tanjore history can hardly be disputed. They are, in one sense, documents of the kingdom and may be taken as authentic to a large extent, since their authors enjoyed the full liberty of knowing things at first hand. The *Sāhityaratnākara* of Yagnanārāyana Dikshita and the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Rāmabadrāmba, both of them in Sanskrit, the *Mannārudāsavilāsam* and the *Ushāpariṇayam* of Raṅgājamma and the *Vijayarāghava Vamśāvali* of Cheṇgalvaḷa Kāḷakavi in Telugu are all contemporary and so constitute very important sources of information among others. Besides these, we have another set of works that contain valuable and very direct information on the doings of the Nayaks as they have been handed to us in the form of *prabhandas* composed by the Nayaks themselves, who were noted for their versatile learning and scholarship as well as for their patronage of poets and of men of letters. The *Sangīta Sudha*[1] by Raghunātha Nāyaka along with the illuminating introduction to it by his well-known minister Gōvinda Dikshita and the *Raghunāthābhyudaya Nātakam* by Vijayarāghava Nayaka contain what may be regarded as the official version of the history of the Tanjore Nayaks; and their value is abundant and obvious, though they are not available to us in their complete form. Tanjore seems to have excelled in having her own historiographer-poets, and in this respect she far surpassed her neighbours like Madura and Gingee. All these works contain almost identical information about facts, expressed in varying diction; but they are not so full of historical facts as one would expect them to be and they contain no chronology. They do not constitute history in the true sense of the word as they are marked by elements of romance, imagination and praise of heroes that are the characteristics of a *kāvya*. Their authors did not aim at writing true and unvarnished history and so the narration of historical details was only incidental to their treatment. They were out to praise and please their patrons and in this they vied with one another, both in the use of pompous language and in the manner of treatment. Still they are historical or, at the least, quasi-historical, poems giving us fair and full ideas regarding the royal capital, the life of the people, the king and his army, his military achievements, his benefactions, his patronage of the different religions of the land, etc., and thus they amplify the truth that the culture and civilisation of an age are best seen reflected in its literature. Hence these are of some value; and a careful study and collation of the information contained in them are very necessary before one arrives at anything definite. There are surprising omissions of otherwise known important historical facts as well as additional information, whose

1. Published in the Journal of the Music Academy, Madras.

validity cannot be accepted without a dispassionate external criticism. For instance, the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Rāmabhadrāmba and the *Sāhityaratnākara* of Yagnanārāyana Dikshita, who was a pupil of Raghunātha Nayaka are strictly contemporary works, since both authors flourished in the same reign. Naturally one would expect from them first-hand and fully reliable information. But unfortunately there are some obvious omissions and several differences in narration which may appear to be negligible, but are very important from the point of view of the student. Rāmabhadrāmba refers to Raghunātha's victories in his early wars fought with the Muhammadans on behalf of his over-lord, Venkatapathi Raya and to the release of the Gingee Nayak from imprisonment on his intervention. The *Sāhityaratnākara* does not contain, strangely enough, even a passing reference to these facts. Besides, they also differ from each other with regard to the date of the installation of Raghunātha as Yuvaraja. The former would put it before Raghunātha's march against the Muhammadans, while the latter would place it somewhat later. As regards the genealogy again these works give varying information. The Sanskrit books are not so full in their account as the Telugu works; and the sifting of details of historical facts from them becomes difficult.

Herein comes to our aid the evidence embodied in the writings of foreign travellers and the Jesuit missionaries who visited South India as propagators of the Catholic faith. The Jesuits were primarily concerned with the growth and expansion of their missionary activity and their mission stations. They were obliged to send home periodical reports of their work and progress. In submitting such reports in long letters they gave a good picture of the prevailing political conditions of the land as also of the conditions precedent to the result of their labours. Extracts from such epistolary sources can be taken as a corrective to and a supplement of the local traditions and literary compositions since the letters were of cultured men who had wide experience. However, they, being foreigners by descent and missionaries by profession, had their own views of things Indian; and hence too much reliance placed on all their information may be rather unsafe, because they might not have had either the privilege of knowing incidents and facts at first hand or of consulting the state archives to which they had evidently no access. At best they can be held to be only secondary sources, though affording considerable material for the history of the 16th and 17th centuries. Besides, the records of the Portuguese and the Dutch factors on the Coromandel Coast contain a wealth of information, regarding the life of the people and the commerce of the land. But they contain, in many places, exaggerated and distorted accounts in vital respects. In such cases it may be possible to

disentangle truth from overstated facts by a careful study of the environment, political and social, and the spirit of the age. The observations of the foreign travellers, like Nuniz, Barradas and others contained in *"Purchas: His Pilgrims"* shed welcome sidelights on many facts and events. Even though they are superfluous to the Jesuit letters in many respects, yet their value is seen in the absence of more reliable information. Barradas's account presents the events following the death of Venkatapathi Raya in all their significant aspects and agrees admirably, in the main, with the internal evidence furnished by the indigenous chronicles and literary works; and it fills up the gap very ably, throwing much light on those obscure facts which would otherwise need further elucidation. Passing references to the customs and manners of the people and other social institutions which these contain are remarkable in their own way and are very useful. The English Factory Records volumes embodying the letters written by the Factors of the trade centres in India to the Directors at home, contain a substantial amount of information about the internal and external trade of the land and also on the business carried on with towns and other centres of industrial or political interest. It was during the period of the Nayak rule that the European nations like the Portuguese, the Danes and the Dutch came and settled on the Coromandel coast and developed trading agencies between South India and other countries. The Nayak rule also witnessed the first attempt made by the English Company to share in the coastal trade of Tanjore. The starting and consolidation of these settlements marked the decline of the former traders of the land, like the Arabs and the Moors.

Epigraphy forms an indispensable aid to history and furnishes it with the substance of documents engraved on stones and other durable material. A good portion of these epigraphs approximately constitute contemporary evidence. They serve as mile-stones and the information contained in them can be said to constitute the skeleton of history. They help in settling questions of chronology and also give incidental insight into the details of the administration and other matters of importance, political and economic, religious and social, and are the most trustworthy records of all periods. Inscriptional evidence is preferable to literary and other information. The historical introductions of the epigraphs containing the genealogy of kings, the chronology of events and the distinguishing *birudas* of the rulers, are of much value, while the substance of the epigraphs throws side-lights upon the religious and social life of the people. The facts mentioned in them are rendered real and living by the literary accounts which form a useful supplement to them. In attaching the requisite value to this category of evidence, one needs to be discriminate and critical, and a note of caution has to be

sounded against the acceptance of spurious and forged documents that claim to be genuine and would go forth for popular consumption. And the inscriptions of the Tanjore Nayaks present a peculiar difficulty in as much as they do not contain any reference to the regnal years and in many cases the Saka era and the cyclic year mentioned do not agree with each other. Almost all the epigraphical information now available has been collected in Robert Sewell's *List of Antiquities,* Madras ; the volumes of *South Indian Inscriptions; the Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy* and *the Travancore Archæological Series* besides other minor publications.

Archæology is a hand-maid to a proper study of history and its remains are silent witnesses to the growth of historical forces as well as of the glorious past. They preserve the art and architecture of the past into the present. The archæological remains belonging to the Tanjore Nayaks are found chiefly in the city of Tanjore and its neighbourhood. The *Śeppanēri,* the feeding reservoir to the present Sivaganga Tank, the cracked fort ramparts, the almost unidentifiable and disappearing moat around it, the dilapidated palace walls, the temples at Mannārgudi and Kumbakōnam and the Vallam fort—all these supply us with much of antiquarian interest and have their own sad story to tell of their pristine glory. The names of villages and streets such as Ayyampēt, Ayyaṇkadai Street, Achyutamaṇgalam, Raghunāthapuram, Gōvindapuram and the Dikshitalingam at Pattīswaram trace their own associations with the Nayaks and their Brahman minister. The presence, even at the present day, of a large body of Telugu speaking people living in various places in the heart of the Tamil land is another instance of the steady migration that took place from the Telugu country during the period of the Vijayanagar and Nayak rule. The famous public library in the Tanjore Palace, called the Saraswati Mahal Library has been built upon the nucleus left by the Nayaks. The Editor of the 'Descriptive Catalogue of the Tanjore Saraswathi Mahal Library' says that the present library is the greatest of Oriental manuscripts libraries and its unique value lies in the fact that it has preserved the literary works of authors spread over three and a half centuries. The collections which were begun 'as early as the 15th century (about 1450) were continued both by the Nayaks and their successors in power, the Marathas. And the change of rule from the Nayaks to the Marathas did not, as is usual with alien invasions, produce any serious unsettlement in the existing social and other conditions of the people of the land. Military successes have always meant a full stop, for a temporary period at any rate, of all lines of progress, particularly in *belles letters,* art and other non-political activities of the vanquished. This was never the case with Tanjore; and

the Maratha rulers seem to have been greater and more enthusiastic patrons of literature and art than their predecessors.'

Coins form another source, and their bearing upon the history of the Tanjore Nayaks has to be proved by future research. Vijayaraghava Nayak's grant to the Dutch postulates the existence of a mint at Tanjore and in some other places.

Apart from these original sources, we have the second hand information contained in the writings of modern historians to which reference has been made above.

## CHAPTER II

# THE FOUNDATION OF THE TANJORE NAYAKSHIP

Tradition says that the Tanjore Nayaks were first appointed to the regular charge of the Chola country by the Vijayanagar emperor, Achyutadēvarāya, (acc. 1529-30 A.D.).[1] This is confirmed by the evidence of Telugu literature like the *Tanjāvūri Andhra Rājulu Charitamu* which says that Śevappa Nayaka who married Mūrtimāmba, the sister of Tirumalāmba, a consort of Achyutadēvarāya, was appointed to the governorship of the Chola country which was given away as dowry to Mūrtimāmba. The Samskrit sources refer to the marriage of Śevappa to Mūrtimāmba, the sister-in-law of Achyutadēvarāya, but do not refer to the gift of *strīdhana*. Yagnanārāyana Dikshita says that Śevappa got Tanjore by his own prowess.[2] There is no inscriptional evidence to substantiate the traditional account which seems to be true and indisputable. The political circumstances of the times under the powerful emperors of Vijayanagar and their southern invasions, particularly by Krishnadēvarāya and his successor Achyutarāya, do not admit the possibility of Śevappa Nayaka's acquiring the principality of Tanjore by conquest or by usurpation. The already established powerful, loyal viceroyalty of Madura on the one hand and the empire on the other would certainly have put down any attempted insurrection or open hostility on the part of Śevappa. And hence his rise to position and power in Tanjore must have been due to the imperial favour and support; and the reference to Śevappa's marriage with Mūrtimāmba in the chronicles and his close relationship to Achyutadēvaraya only bear ample testimony to his rise under the royal patronage. But there is no unanimity among the various chronicles as regards the date of the actual appointment of Śevappa to the viceroyalty of the Tanjore territory.

Different dates are given by scholars for the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship. (1) There is a tradition which says that a Kannada Brahman of the name of Gōvinda Dīkshita, then a boy of seventeen, well versed in the Śāstras as well as in palmistry and astrology, migrated to the then flourishing city of Vijayanagara and there came

1. 40 of 1900 is dated in Virōdhi and in the month of Kārtika. 157 of 1924 from Kālahasti is dated in Saka 1452; also 200 of 1910.

2. "Sāhityaratnākara" by Yagnanārāyana Dikshita, edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani, University of Madras, Canto III, Sloka 1.

into contact with Achyutarāya who invited that Brahman along with other astrologers, to predict the future of the son that had just been born to him. Admiring his knowledge of Jyōtisha Śāstra, the emperor is said to have honoured him. Shortly after this event, the Dikshita came across a Nayaka orphan, Śeva by name, whom he took into his service. Finding in him signs of future greatness, Gōvinda Dīkshita introduced him to Achyutarāya, who had him appointed as his Tāmbūla Karaṇḍavāhin (betel-bearer)—an office of importance in the court, which brought the holder into personal association with the Rāya. Soon, Śeva, the betel-page, distinguished himself in Achyutarāya's wars; and in due course, Mūrtimāmba, the sister of Rāya's consort Tirumalāmba, who fell in love with him was married to him. Achyutarāya appointed him to the governorship of Tanjore which was then in need of a strong ruler. Śeva, on going to Tanjore, took the Dīkshita along with him; and this is said to have happened in the year 1540 A.D.[3]

This account which is relied on by some, falls flat for want of confirmation; nor can it stand the test of intensive criticism. Inscriptional evidence shows that Śevappa belonged to a family of nobles who had for some time been ruling over the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam country. Moreover, Gōvinda Dīkshita who is said to have been the minister of two kings in the Tanjore epigraphs of this period, is mentioned in a record dated 1634 A.D., [4] and this is the latest year so far available for him. Beginning from 1528 A.D. when a son was born to Achyutarāya and ending with 1634 A.D.,[5] the latest known date for Gōvinda Dikshita, and adding seventeen years to which age he had attained when he first came to Vijayanagara, we find that Gōvinda Dīkshita must have lived for more than hundred and twenty years which is absolutely impossible. The inscriptions assign a period of thirteen years from 1529 to 1542 A.D. for the reign of Achyutarāya. In that case the traditional date, A.D. 1540 given above, would place the appointment of Śevappa towards the end of his reign. The *Tanjāvūri Andhra Rājula Charitamu*, the two Sanskrit contemporary poems and the epigraphs, all refer to Gōvinda Dikshita, the illustrious minister, as having flourished only in the last

3. "Gōvinda Dikshita and his times" by Mr. N. K. Venkatesam Pantulu, in the "Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society," Vol. II, Part II. Also "Sāhityaratnākara," Introduction, page 2.

4. 290 of 1927 is dated S. 1553 Prajōtpatti. 257 of 1927, Bava corresponding to A.D. 1634.

5. "Sources of Vijayanagara History", edited by Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar: p. 170 and Introduction, p. 12.

days of Śevappa and not in the earlier part of his reign. Hence this account is unreliable for want of confirmatory evidence.

Secondly, the year 1541 A.D. is assigned for the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship by the Rev. Father Heras.[6] The learned Father arrives at this date on the ground that Viswanātha Nayaka, the founder of the Madura line of viceroys, was also appointed by Achyutarāya to the southern viceroyalty towards the end of his reign, *i.e.*, about 1541 A.D. And so Father Heras would assign the foundation of the Tanjore and Madura Nayakships to the same date. His arguments in support of this assumption are not conclusive and in one place positively weak. He says (on p. 124, Note 3) that after the execution of Vīraśēkhara Chōḷa, Viswanātha was appointed to be in charge of both Madura and Tanjore. He gives no authority for the execution of the Chola king, in spite of the fact that there is no evidence except tradition referring to the rule of a Chōḷa king at all.[7] The *Tanjāvūri Añdhra Rājula Charitamu*' is definite in assigning the foundation of the Madura Nayakship during the time of Krishnadēvarāya, and Prof. Sathianatha Aiyar[8] has dated the foundation of the Madura Nayak's rule in 1529 A.D. Again, the Telugu chronicle[9] says that soon after the death of Chandraśekhara Pāndya in whose life time itself Viswanātha Nayaka had been nominated to rule over Madura, the Pāṇḍyan having abdicated in his favour and retired into private life, Viswanātha Nayak began to rule over both the Pāṇdya and Chōḷa kingdoms. Nothing is known about the fate of the Chōḷa ruler, Vīraśēkhara. Mr. Venkasami Rao (*The Tanjore Manual*, p. 750) adds that, the fate of Vīraśēkhara Chōḻa is not clearly known. He either fell in battle with Nagama Nayaka or was subsequently put to death; and his issue, if he had any, probably shared the same fate; for nothing more is heard of the Chola race.' Thus he proves the impossiblity of a Chola ruling over Tanjore at the time of Viswanatha Nayak's accession to Madura after he defeated his father Nagama Nayaka in battle. Hence it becomes probable that there was no Chola king at the time of the appointment of Śevappa. Even the

6. 'The Aravidu dynasty of Vijayanagar' by Rev. H. Heras, p. 170 and p. 124 and Note 3.

7. Father Heras believes the first part of the traditional story but would not give his reasons for discarding the rest of it which refers to the establishment of the Madura Nayak by Krishnadēvarāya.

8. 'The Nayaks of Madura', Madras University Historical Series No. 2.

9. The 'Tanjāvūri Añdhra Rājulu Charitamu' edited by V. Prabhakara Sastri, Vavilla Press; also "Sources," Dr. S. K. Aiyangar.

*Achyutarāyābhyudayam* of Rājanātha Diṇḍima[10] which describes in detail the early conquests of Achyutarāya in the South, does not mention the existence of a Chōḻa king of Tanjore at the time. Tirumalāmba, in her *Varadāmbikaparinayam,* refers to the defeat and imprisonment of a Chōḷa at the hands of Achyutarāya's father, Narasa Nayaka, and says that the Chōḻa is said to have escaped for his life to the sea coast.[11] The name of this Chōḻa is not known. If there was any Chōḷa king at the time of Achyutraya's *digvijaya* in the south, the *Achyutarāyabhyudayam* would have at least made mention of him. It is only the *Tanjāvūri Andhra Rājula Charitamu* and the *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitamu* that refer to Vīraśēkhara Chōḷa who was responsible for the coming of Nāgama Nayaka and Viswanātha Nayaka to the south.[12] The *Karnātaka Rājākkaḷ Śavistāra Charitam* says that Krishnadēvarāya who conquered eastern Karnātaka and derived therefrom a revenue of three crores of rupees, had to divide his empire into three parts and to appoint three viceroys over them. Thus, according to this chronicle, Tubāki Krishnappa Nayaka was placed in the administrative charge of that strip of land which is bounded by Nellore on the north and the river Coleroon in the south, with Gingee as the capital. Vijayarāghava Nayaka was appointed to rule the Chōḻa country from the capital city of Tanjore; and Venkatappa Nayaka was commissioned to administer the land further south.[13] This account would suggest that these three viceroyalties were founded about the year 1518 A.D., the date of Krishnadēvarāya's return from his northern conquests. There is no other internal or external evidence to support the *Karnātaka Rājakkal Savistara Charitam*; and if too much stress is laid on this statement then it would antedate the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship and bring in other anachronisms and conflicts. Moreover, the inscriptions of Krishnadēvarāya in the south show that there was one Vira Narasingarāya who was in charge of the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and Chōḻa countries as the king's

10. Sources. P. 159. Achyutarāya is said to have entered the Chōḷa country unopposed. A Chōḷa king is mentioned on p. 164 and this was Śellappa, who rebelled against him.

11. The '*Varadāmbikaparinayam*" by Tirumalāmba. Edited by Mr. Lakshman Sarup, Lucknow. Also sources, p. 174.

12. 'The Nayaks of Madura,' Introduction, page 9. 'It is just possible that complaints reached head-quarters in some number and one complainant with more pretentious claims even waited upon Krishnarāya in person. The only flaw in the story as given in the chronicles is that we have so far come upon no epigraphical evidence of the existence of a Chandrasékhara Pāṇdya in Madura or of a Vīraśēkhara Chōḷa in the Chōḷa country though neither case is impossible.'

13. 'The Aravidu Dynasty', p. 112.

deputy.[14] Contemporary Telugu and Sanskrit literature and the traditional accounts recorded in the *Mackenzie Manuscripts* and in the *Tanjavūri Andhra Rājula Charitamu* and the *Tanjāvūri Vari Charitam* clearly show that the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship took place only in the reign of Achyutarāya. The epigraphs also point to the same conclusion. As the internal evidence regarding the Tanjore Nayaks has been well established, we need not hesitate to subscribe to the view that Achyutarāya nominated Śevappa as governor over the Tanjore principality. If this is agreed upon, another date, 1549 A.D., given by Mr. Kuppuswamy Sastri in the *Tanjore Gazetteer* and accepted for the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship will have to be abandoned, since the reign of Achyutarāya came to an end in 1542 A.D.[15] and there was Sadāsivarāya ruling over Vijayanagara in A.D. 1549. Mr. T. S. Kuppuswami Sastri tells us of Śevappa's appointment by Achyutarāya; but he is more inclined to believe the version of *Sāhityaratnākara* that Śevappa got Tanjore by the strength of his own arm. Relying on this evidence, he ascribes 1549 A.D. as the date of Śevappa's accession to power and adds support to it by saying that the Samasarupalli epigraph of this Nayaka which is dated in the year 1549 (S. 1471) is the earliest record issued by him. The *Tanjore Gazetteer* (1906), following Mr. Kuppu-Swami Sastri, assigns 1549 A.D.; and in support of this date it advances arguments that Achyutarāya died in A.D. 1542 and there was Rāmarāja Viṭhaladēva, the able co-adjutor and general of Sadāsiva, who remained in the south till 1544 A.D. So it is concluded that Śevappa must have come to power only after the retirement of Rāmaraja Viṭhala from the south. Following Nelson, the *District Gazetteer* would also assign A.D. 1559 as the date for the foundation of the Madura Nayakship. That this date is untenable is proved by Achyutarāya's inscription which refers to his gift made for the merit of his agent, Viswanātha Nayaka, as early as A.D. 1535.[16] This epigraph is important as it definitely proves that Madura was under Viswanātha Nayaka even in that year.[17] The *Tan-*

14. '*The Nayaks of Madura,*' Introd. 8. The period 1520-5 seems to be a period of activity in organisation and may be regarded as the time when he appointed Vīranarasimha as viceroy of the Chōḻa country and gave the commission to Nāgama to organise the province of Madura; and the appointment of Vīra Narasimha to the Chōḻa country would indicate the appointment of a similar officer of high standing for Madura.

15. 373 of 1911.

16. 113 of 1908 Tirupattur, Ramnad District.

17. '*The Nayaks of Madura,*' pp. 44 and 296, Appendix C. All that we know of Viswanātha Nayaka from inscriptions, chronicles and other sources further confirms our contention that the Nayakship of Madura under him was an accomplished fact

*javūri Andhra Rājula Charitamu* says that Viswanātha who was appointed by Krishnadēvarāya was for some time governing the Chōḷa country as well, after the death of Krishnadēvarāya until Śevappa was specially appointed to Tanjore by Achyutarāya.[18] This would prove that the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship could not have been far removed from the date of the foundation of the Madura Nayakship. Prof. Sathianatha Aiyar has proved that 1529 A.D. must be the initial date of the Madura Nayakship and that it was created in the last days of Krishnadēvarāya. In this connection his remarks on the validity and reliability of the statements contained in the *Tanjāvūri Andhra Rājula Charitamu* may be quoted :—'The facts contained in this account which are capable of verification are so singularly correct that the whole narrative compels conviction as a faithful description of the transactions'. Equally apt is the observation made by William Taylor regarding the *Tanjāvūri Vāri Charitam* when he says: 'I consider the document very valuable as a contribution towards the history of the Tanjore country during the whole of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.' According to these accounts the Tanjore Nayakship was founded by Achyutarāya shortly after the foundation of the Madura Nayakship, and it also proves the impossibility of a Chōḷa ruling just previous to the time of Śevappa's nomination to its charge, when it says that Viswanātha was then in charge of both the principalities. Mr. Venkasami Rao's[19] date, A.D. 1530 assigned for the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship is a little early as it shows that the same had happened towards the end of Krishnadēvarāya's reign. The reason for his discountenancing the account of the chronicles in general and of the *Tanjāvūri Varī Charitam* in particular is given out to be that after the death of Krishnadēvarāya the empire began to sink and hence no intervention in the affairs of the south could

before the death of Krishnadēvarāya in 1530. John Nieuhoff also refers to the rule of the Madura Nayaks in the year 1533.

18. 'T. A. R. Charitam,' p. 17. Also 'Sources', p. 323.

19. *The Tanjore Manual*. 1883 p. 748-9. Mr. Venkasami Rao relying on Dr. Caldwell's List of Vijayanagar kings as is given in his History of the Tinnevelly District pp. 45-6 says that the "Varicharitra mentions the name of a Raya who appointed the first viceroy of Tanjore as Achyuta" and adds "that the intervention of Vijayanagar in the affairs of Madura and Tanjore took place during the reign of Krishnadēvarāya than that it took place after it when the power of Vijayanagar was sinking. At the same time the interval between Nāgama Nayaka's expedition and the appointment of the first viceroy to Tanjore by Achyuta assuming the latter to be a fact could not have been long. On the whole, in the absence of more satisfactory data, the date of the subversion of the Chola dynasty and the commencement of the Nayak rule in Tanjore may, it seems, be safely fixed about A.D. 1530." He would also assign a period of about 132 years for the Nayak's rule.

have been possible. He believed then that the accession of Achyutarāya saw only the beginning of the rapid decline and downfall of the empire. And so he concluded safely that all the changes that might have taken place in the politics of the south, must have happened only during the reign of Krishnadēvarāya and more probably about the time when he commissioned his general, Nāgama Nāyaka, to effect a complete conquest of the south with a view to reorganising it. But subsequent researches into the then unexplored fields of epigraphy and other literature, have brought to light that Achyutarāya was not after all the craven that he was supposed to be, but was as good and powerful a ruler as his predecessor, and also the fact that the empire did in fact survive for more than a century after the death of Krishnadēvarāya. The *Achyutarāyabhydayam* bears evidence to the successful *digvijaya* led by Achyutarāya into the south and also the victories won by his general Śalakam Tirumalarāja. And from other pieces of evidence it is quite possible to surmise that Tanjore was not under any separate governor or ruler at the time of Achyutarāya's invasion. Thus it becomes clear that the date does not seem to be quite settled and needs revision in the light of subsequent accumulation of material. The inscriptions of the period also refer to the same state of affairs.

South India came under the influence of Vijayanagar as early as 1358 when Kumara Kampana began his victorious campaign into the south.[20] The presence of numerous epigraphs that are found scattered all over the country bears ample testimony to the overlordship of Vijayanagar Empire from about the 3rd quarter of the 14th century. Narasa Nayaka's expedition to the south and his victories over the Chōḻa and Pāṇḍya kings were referred to already.[21] That South India continued under Vijayanagar for long without any interruption and the fact that the old principalities continued for some time under their old hereditary rulers like the Chōḻas and the Pāṇḍyas who became feudatories of the new power, are established by the testimony alike of literature and inscriptions.

With the accession of Krishnadēvarāya a new epoch began in the history of South India. Hitherto the Vijayanagara emperors could not devote much of their time to the consolidation of their authority and the organisation of their hold over the southern principalities, as their

20. Madhurāvijayam or Kamparāya Charitam by Gaṇgādēvī edited by Pandit Srinivasachari, Trivandrum. Also 'Sources'.

21. The 'Varadāmbikāparinayam'.

Muhammadan enemies on the north were engaging much of their attention. Krishnadēvarāya, having defeated his enemies in the north completely, found the necessary leisure to reconstitute and reorganise the southern principalities; and he set himself to this task soon. According to the chronicles, Madura and Tanjore which were then ruled by scions of the old lines of the Pāṇḍyas and the Chōḻas respectively, caused some trouble, and a Chōḻa ruler is said to have risen in revolt and captured Madura, setting aside the claims of a Pāṇḍya and this led to the latter's appeal for help to Krishnadēvarāya, their overlord.[22] Nāgama Nayaka's southern expedition was the immediate result of this, and Nāgama claimed to have defeated the Chōḻa and reinstated the Pāṇḍya whose birth was found out to be illegitimate. About the same time parts of the Chōḻa and the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam countries were put in charge of another great general who was called Vīra Narasingarāya Nayaka. His inscriptions are largely to be found in the south ranging in dates from 1510 to 1530 A.D.[23] 83 of 1923 of Achyutarāya, dated Saka 1451, gives the information

22. Dr. Caldwell (History of the Tinnevelly District) says that the Chola referred to in the Chronicles was perhaps Chennaya Bālaya who figures in an inscription coming from Srirangam and dated Saka 1453 (A.D. 1531). This view is incorrect since we find Viswanatha Nayaka to be the ruler of both Madura and Tanjore for sometime about this period and the presence of epigraphs of Viswanatha in Srirangam proves this. However, there are numerous epigraphs to show that there were scions of the Chola race ruling as governors over small principalities of the land, not independently of the Vijayanagar authority. Some of them even traced their descent from the Cholas of Uraiyūr; but none of them seems to have had or enjoyed power as became an independent ruler.

23. 91 and 92 of 1908 Tiruppattur, Ramnad S1432 give him the surname Śellappa with the honorary affix swami.

361 of 1908 Māṅgādu, Tanjore District S 1437 says that Vira Narasinga belonged to the Agastya *gōtra* and Bōdhāyanasūtra.

256 of 1910. Urattur Achyutarāya S. 1451 mentions Śellappa alias Vira Narasinga Sāluva Daṇṇāyakar.

83 of 1923 Chingleput district: Achyuta S 1451 gift for the merit of Vira Narasingarāya.

544 of 1919. Little Conjeevaram S 1454 Achyuta *i.e.*, two years after his coronation. Records that in the year Virodhi on the day of his coronation Achyuta directed Sāluva Nayaka to assign certain villages to Varadāraja and Ekambaranātha equally neither more or less. But as Sāluva Nayaka gave more to Ekambaranātha, Achyuta hearing this equalised the number of villages by redistribution.

545 of 1919. Same as 544 above. This inscription is very important.

390 of 1914 Tiruvarangulam 1515 A.D. gift of taxes for the merit of Vira Narasingarāya Nayakar.

that, that general was also known by the names of Śellappa and Sāḷuva Nayaka and another epigraph (182 of 1929-30) dated Saka 1431 in the reign of Krishnadēvarāya says that he was the son of one Taḻuvakkuḻaindān Bhattar, a dēvakanmi of the Kānchi (Conjeevaram) temple. Vira Narasingarāya Nayaka seems to have entered the Imperial service as early as 1509 A.D. The provenance of his records shows that he was ruling over the south-eastern portions of the Vijayanagara empire, comprising the modern districts of North and South Arcot, Chingleput and Tanjore and also part of Ramnad district. Vīra Narasingarāya Sāḷuva Nayaka of the epigraphs of Krishnadēvarāya and Achyutarāya is perhaps identical with the Sālvanāyque of Nuniz[24] who says that "Sālvanāyque, the present minister; he has a revenue of a million and a hundred thousand pardaos. He is the lord of Coramandel (Charamaondel) and of Negapatam (Negapatao) and Tanjore (Tangore) and Bomgrin (Bhuvanagiri ?), Devipatnam (Depatao) and Truguel, (Sewell says Tirukkovilur) and Caullin and all of these are cities: their territories are all very large and border on Ceylon. He is obliged to give a third of his revenues to the king and two-thirds remain for him for the expenses of his lascarins and horses, which he is obliged to main-

233 of 1901 Achcharapākkam S. 1450 Virodhi, mentions Vira Narasingarāya Nayaka who is called a Ubhayapradhāni of the king.

63 of 1923 Chingleput District gift to Śellappar Taḻuvakkuḻaindān Bhattar alias Vira Narasingarāya Nayakkar.

225 of 1916 Sengamal. S. 1442 Śellappar Vira Narasingarāya Nayaka is called the son of Taḻuvakkuḻaindān Bhattar.

399 of 1906. Tirumayam, S. 1444 gift by Vira Narasingarāya Nayakar.

182 of 1929-30. Chingleput district S 1431 (1509 A.D.) Sāluva Nayakkar Śellappar, son of Taḻuvakkuḻaindān Bhattar who is called a Dēvakanmi of the Kānchi temple.

390 of 1912. Dēvikapuran. 1515 A.D. refers to Vira Narasingarāya Nayaka.

487 of 1920. Singaperumāl Koil 1531 A.D. Gift by Taḻuvakkuḻaindān Bhattar for the merit of Śellappa Sāluva Daṇṇāyakar.

Dr. S. K. Ayyangar's ('Nayaks of Madura' and 'Sources', Introduction) view that Vira Narasingarāya's rebellion and Nāgama's revolt are inter-related is not tenable since the latter happened in the last days of Krishnadēvarāya and the rebellion of Vira Narasinga took place in the early years of Achyutarāya when Madura was firmly established under Viswanatha Nayaka the son of Nāgama Nayaka. Nāgama's rebellion was put an end to by Krishnadēvarāya himself before 1529 which marks the beginning of the reign of Viswanātha Nayaka. Śellappa's rebellion took place in 1531 *ie.*, two years after the final settlement of the Madura affairs.

24. 'A Forgotten Empire'—Sewell, p. 384. Nuniz speaks of the feudal lords of Krishnadēvarāya. Also on p. 281 he says that Krishnadēva had five kings as his subject lords. Nuniz calls Sālvanāyque 'the present minister.'

tain for the king, *viz.,* thirty thousand foot and three thousand horse and thirty elephants; so that he only gets the balance after deducting the expenses of this force, Nuniz calls him 'the present minister' of Krishnadēvarāya, and an inscription of the same king (233 of 1901) dated 1528 A.D. calls Vīra Narasingarāya as Ubhayaprādhāni. The account of Nuniz and the epigraphical evidence taken together clearly show that Vīra Narasingarāya Sāluva Nayaka must have been a powerful feudatory and minister of Krishnadēvarāya and of Achyutarāya, enjoying a big territory and a large revenue and he also maintained a well equipped army composed of elephants and horses. Achyutarāya's gift for his merit in the year 1529 A.D. shows the supreme position which Vīra Narasingarāya held in the empire. Nuniz also confirms this when he says that Sālvanāyque became the minister of the kingdom and governed the country till the coming of Achetarao (Achyutarāya) from the fortress of Chandragery (Chandragiri) ".[25]

If Vira Narasingarāya Sāḷuva Nayaka was a powerful ruler of all the eastern parts including the Chola country in the time of Krishnadēvarāya till the end of his reign and also in the reign of Achyutarāya, then one may well ask, where was the necessity for Achyuta to appoint Śevappa Nayaka as the ruler of Tanjore or what were the circumstances that led to the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship? This question is answered by the evidence of the epigraphs and also by the contemporary literary evidence contained in the *Achyutarāyābhyudayam.* Vīra Narasingarāya seems to have grown powerful enough to set at defiance the orders of Krishnadēvarāya in his last days.[26] The Tiruppanangādu epigraph[27] says that he exacted the taxes of *jodi* (a kind of quit rent) and *sulavari* from the inhabitants of the village, contrary to the expressed order of Krishnadēvarāya, who made a remission of these taxes amounting to 10,000 pardaos in favour of the Siva and

25. 'A Forgotten Empire' by Sewell, p. 367.

26. Studies in the Third dynasty of Vijayanagara by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, University of Madras. A good account of Vira Narasingarāya's activities is given in pages 22-32. Dr. N. V. Ramanayya, p. 23, says that it is not true to say that Vīra Narasingarāya rebelled in the very last years of Krishnadēvarāya. Dr. S. K. Ayyangar says that he rebelled against Krishnadēva in his last days ('*Nayaks of Madura',: Introduction*, p. 9). Even though the inscriptions and literature do not refer to any open rebellion of Vīra Narasinga still his aim at independence very early is supported by the epigraphs.

27. 253 of 1906 dated S. 1453 Khara. Records that Vīra Narasingarāya exacted jodi though this tax was given in favour of Tiruppanangādu temple under the orders of Sāluva Timma, the minister of Krishnadēva during the latter's time.

Vishnu temples of the south.[28] The Tirukkadaiyūr epigraph (246 of 1925) which records the remission of the same taxes by the king, when it was brought to his notice by the *bhattars* (priests) of the temple that the remission ordered earlier was not given effect to, perhaps has some reference to Vīra Narasingarāya's growing insubordination even from the year A.D. 1521. Krishnadēvarāya did not live long enough to bring back this insubordinate vassal to a sense of subordination, and so it fell to the lot of Achyutarāya, his successor. Vīra Narasingarāya continued to exhibit the same recalcitrant attitude towards Achyutarāya also, and this is mentioned in a record dated 1532 A.D. (544 of 1919) coming from Little Conjeevaram. The record refers to the rule of Sāḷuva Nāyaka and to a gift of a number of villages made by Achyutarāya at the time of his coronation. Vira Narasingarāya Sāḷuva Nāyaka who was directed by Achyuta to assign this gift of villages to the Varadarāja and Ēkāmbaranātha temples equally 'neither more or less' to either, appears to have broken the royal order by assigning more villages to the Siva temple. The record continues that King Achyuta on hearing this, equalised the gifts by effecting a redistribution in 1532 A.D. Deviation from the royal provision in the order was regarded a serious crime which might result in the loss of life sometimes. Achyuta was perhaps dissatisfied with his misconduct and stubborn character and had him removed from the high offices of *pradhāni* and viceroy in A.D. 1531. An inscription[29] from the same place refers to one Bōgayyadēva Mahārāja of the solar race and a descendant of the Chōḷas of Uraiyur who is said to have succeeded Vira Narasingarāya to the rulership of those parts and restored the gift of taxes such as *jodi,* etc., amounting to 50 *pon* to the temple in the same year (A.D. 1531).

Vīra Narasingarāya who fell in the estimate of Achyutarāya and who was driven out of office, found himself in a desperate situation and so turned a rebel, perhaps with the idea of opposing the king and setting up an independent rule. In this endeavour he was not able to enlist the co-operation of the powerful Madura ruler, Viswanātha Nayak, and so he advanced further south and sought the aid of the Tiruvadi king.[30]

28. 137 of 1927, 210 of 1917, 100 of 1931-32, 223 of 1927, 184 of 1925, 226, 235 and 251 of 1925.

29. 253 of 1906 dated S 1453 expired Khara.

30. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, p. 27, says that the Chēra King mentioned must be the King of Quilon. Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao 'Travancore Archaeological Series,' Vol. I and Dr. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar 'Sources of the Vijayanagara History,' Introd. say that the king who joined the renegade rebel Śellappa was the king

He was joined by another rebel, Tumbichchi Nayaka, the ruler of Paramakkudi situated in the Madura country. The reason for his revolt is not known for certain; perhaps he was not in favour of Viswanātha's administration. Vira Narasingarāya *alias* Śellappa, soon gaining strength seems to have defeated the neighbouring Pāṇḍyas of Tenkāsi as a consequence of which the Pāṇḍyan king who was deprived of his kingdom sought the help of Achyutarāya for his restoration. The *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* which describes in great detail this victorious campaign of Achyutarāya in the south, and also the Pāṇḍyan restoration, does not mention either the causes for Vira Narasingarāya's revolt or the rise of Tumbichchi Nayaka but refers to the former's escape to the Chēra country and to his defeat of the Pāṇḍyas. The news of Śellappa's disorderly conduct and organised rebellion reached the king who started on an expedition with a large army under the leadership of his brother-in-law Salakarāju Tirumalarāya. Vīra Narasingarāya did not suffer any defeat at the hands of the Imperial army before his escape to the Tiruvadi country.[31] The *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* describes the marching of Achyutarāya's army and the route it took to reach Srirangam. Śalakarāju Tirumalarāya with the army started on the Tiruvadi campaign under the orders of the king who having despatched the troops stayed behind at Srirangam where he is said to have led a happy life in the company of its Pandits.

of Travancore. The latter view seems to be correct. The Travancore kings were called Tiruvadis. [Âditya Varma and his brother Bhūtala Vira Sri Vira Udaya Mārtānda Varma ruled the Travancore country in the early decades of the 16th century. The latter was followed in 1535 by Bhūtala Vira Kērala Varma. They were known as Tiruvadis and enjoyed dominion in South Tinnevelly. Thus Mārtānda Varma was the Senior Tiruvadi of Siraivoy and Kerala Varma was the Senior Tiruvadi of Jayasimhanād (*The Travancore Manual*: Vol. I, pp. 296-7).] [Ed.]

31. *Achyutarāyābhyudayam*; *Sources*, pp. 158 and 162, Slokas 47 to 59. Dr. S. K. Ayyangar says on p. 152, Śellappa who had revolted and after being defeated in battle escaped from his province and had taken refuge with the Travancore king. Also N. Venkataramanayya's "Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara,' p. 29. But a careful reading of the slokas 47-59 would show definitely that there is nothing in them to refer to Vira Narasingaraya's defeat before he fled to Travancore. One of them (sloka 46) says, चन्नविग्रहतया पलायित चेल्लपो वसति चेरसीमणि। चन्नविग्रहतया- would simply mean 'under disguise.' The word पुन: which means 'again' in sloka 57 is perhaps understood by these scholars to mean a second fight. But a careful reading of that line would show that the word पुन: is an *Avyaya* (indeclinable) and does not connote its meaning but should be read along with the preceding word, मदवतां. The author who expatiates on the morals has put this word to lay emphasis and this interpretation is justified by the succeeding words ननु शज लक्षणम्.

Śalakam Tirumalarāya's defeat of the Chēra king and his victorious return to Srirangam taking Śellappa and the Chēra ruler as captives are all mentioned in the *Achyutarāyābhyudayam*. Achyuta punished the Chēra king and re-established the Pāṇḍyan king on the throne. But what happened to Vīra Narasingarāya and Tumbichchi Nayaka is not at all stated, but their complete defeat is evident from the Kālahasti and the Conjeevaram Inscriptions.[32] The Tiruvadi king who suffered this humiliation was Udayamārtāndavarman.[33] The inscriptions and the *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* definitely say that Vīra Narasingarāya who was in administrative control of the Chōḻadēśa besides others, rose in revolt and he suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Śalakarāju Tirumalarāya the able general of Achyutarāya. We learn from the same sources that Vīra Narasingarāya was not reappointed to the governorship of the Chōḻa country. Then what became of Tanjore ? Did Tanjore pass under the powerful Madura Nayak, or did it remain independent of it ? Inscriptions, tradition and literary evidence prove that Tanjore remained independent of Madura and became the seat of a new government under one Śevappa Nayaka, appointed by Achyutarāya himself. The foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship was evidently the immediate result of the suppression of Vira Narasingarāya's rebellion. Tradition says that Viswanātha Nāyaka was ruling over Tanjore also for some time. Achyutarāya apprehending danger and suspecting the loyalty of Viswanātha Nāyaka who might rise in opposition to the Empire as his father Nāgama Nayaka did before if left supreme in the south, thought perhaps of making Tanjore independent of Madura and directly subordinate to himself. Besides, there was the Chōḻa ruler handy to be put in charge of it since Viswanātha Nayaka is said to have been then ruling Tanjore as well. Moreover, to put an end to the future troubles such as the rise of any rival Chōḻas—if there should be any of them—the need for a strong ruler was also felt by the king. And the dismissal and the defeat of Śellappa left Tanjore without a ruler. Achyuta also saw for himself the difficulties and dangers in having a single viceroy to administer a large territory comprising almost the whole of the Eastern Karnātaka empire. These causes combined together greatly emphasised the need for the appointment of a capable governor over Tanjore. To ensure proper and good government, to check other feudatories from transcending their limits and to have a loyal supporter of the empire behind, Achyutarāya made a new settlement according to which he

32. 157 of 1924 and 'Tirumalai Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphical Report', p. 221. Also, 'Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara,' pp. 22-23.

33. 'Travancore Archaeological series,' Vol. I, p. 55.

reorganised his southern portions of his empire entirely on a new basis.[34] The southern territories excluding Madura were split up into two main divisions on the traditional basis, *viz.,* the Chōḻa and the Toṇdai maṇdalams. Tanjore became the seat of the government by virtue of its geographical position at the head of the delta system and other natural advantages it had. Śevappa Nayaka, the powerful general and a near relation of the king, was appointed to rule over Tanjore, as he was then considered to be the most loyal and efficient man on whom the empire can rely for its support and co-operation. The Tanjore Nayaks by their unflinching loyalty and timely co-operation with the empire amply justified their choice. Political circumstances, diplomacy and statesmanship were responsible for the appointment of Śevappa Nayaka as the viceroy of the Chōḻa country.[35] If this was the arrangement made by Achyuta, then what is the date of the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship ?

Vira Narasingarāya, *alias* Śellappa's inscriptions range from 1510 to 1531 A.D. and so he must have rebelled in the year 1531 A.D.[36] the year following the coronation of Achyutarāya. The *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* gives no dates and regarding the rise of Śellappa it simply says that on one day after his coronation the matter was reported by the minister to the king. But there are epigraphs which come to our help in arriving at a satisfactory date. The Kālahasti and the Tirupati records of Achyuta say that his southern expedition was completed before July 27, 1532 A.D.,[37] as they note 'that he went on a war with the Ṭiruvadi and levied tribute from him, brought under subjection Tumbichchi Nayaka, Sāluva Nayaka, and also the Ummātur chiefs.' His northern conquests began about the middle of 1534 A.D. An epigraph from Little Conjeevaram belonging to Achyuta and dated Saka 1454, cyclic, Nandana, corresponding to

34. The exchange of Vallam for Trichinopoly which was effected according to the *T. A. R, Charitamu* by the Madura Nayaka, must have happened about this time and the transaction must have been made by the king himself.

35. There is no inscription to refer to Śevappa earlier than 1549 A.D. The epigraphs bearing the later dates show however, the establishment of Śevappa as the first ruler. *The T. A. R. Charitamu, T. V. Charitam, the Raghunāthābhyudaya Nātakam, Vijayavilāsam, Sangitā Sudha, Ushāparinayam* and *Rukmani Parinayam* refer to the rule of the Tanjore Nayaks beginning from Śevappa. The Maratha records, the Factory Records and the numerous letters written by the Portuguese and the Jesuit missionaries also refer to the Nayak rule.

36. Śellappa's rebellion in 1530 A.D. is confirmed by Ferishta who speaking of the success of Adil Shah at Raichur in 1530 A.D. says that 'against this prince (Ram Raj) rebellions were excited by several Rays (Rāyas) so that the Muhammadans met with no interruption to their progress. Briggs, Vol. III, p. 66.

37. 157 of 1924.

1532 A.D. says that he gave effect to his early orders issued to Śellappa and redistributed the villages equally to the Ēkāmbaranātha and Varadarāja temples.[38] The *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* says that Achyuta was staying at Srirangam till the return of Śalakarāju Tirumalarāya from the Tiruvadi expedition. From Srirangam Achyutarāya is said to have proceeded against the Ummattūr chiefs. Besides, Achyutarāya was able to finish his southern campaign by the end of 27th July, 1532 A.D. the date of the Kālahasti inscription. The Ummattūr campaign would have taken him at least a period of three or four months. If we can allow this period of four months, then we arrive at the beginning of the year 1532 A.D. when Achyuta must have been staying at Srirangam. The defeat of the Tiruvadi king and the submission of Śellappa in 1531-32 would have taken place earlier, i.e., in 1531-2 A.D. Perhaps Śellappa's reduction and defeat must have made Achyutarāya finally settle the problem of reorganising his southern territories before his departure for Seringapatam from Srirangam. His bitter experience of Śellappa's disloyalty would have naturally impressed on him the need of appointing a loyal and trusted man as his deputy in the Chōḻa country. Probably this was the reason that weighed with him in appointing Śevappa Nayaka his close relation as the ruler of Tanjore in the beginning of the year 1532 A.D. which then is in all probabilty the year of the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship. This date is confirmed by the reliable traditional account contained in the *Tanjāvūri Añdhra Rājula Charitamu* which says that Viswanātha Nayaka who was appointed to rule over the Madura country by Krishnadēvarāya 'became the sole ruler of the Pāṇḍya and Chōḻa kingdom and Krishnadēvarāya died sometime after this and was succeeded by Achyutarāya.[39] Achyuta appointed this Śevappa as sole viceroy over the Chōḻa country which had till then continued along with the Pāṇḍya country'. Also, Prof. Sathianatha Aiyar has fixed the date of the foundation of the Madura Nayakship and the beginning of Viswanātha Nayaka's rule in 1529 A.D. He says: 'Shortly after, the Chōḻa country was separated from the viceroyalty of Madura and entrusted to Śevappa Nayaka.'[40] These foregoing statements clearly show that the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship followed in quick succession the foundation of the Madura Nayakship and so 1532 A.D. marks the beginning of the establishment of the feudatory rule of the Tanjore Nayaks.

38. 544 of 1919. The inscription records his gift of villages made to these two temples at Kānchi which was under the rule of Vira Narasingarāya. Vira Narasingarāya set at defiance the royal order early in 1531 A.D.

39. 'Sources of Vijayanagar History,' p. 323.

40. 'The Nayaks of Madura,' p. 52.

## CHAPTER III

## ŚEVAPPA NAYAKA (CIR. 1532 TO 1580 A.D.)

Śevappa Nayaka also known as Chinna Śeva[1], Śevanṛpati and Śevabhūpa in Sanskrit and Siru Seva[2] in Tamil, was thus the founder of the Nayak dynasty of Tanjore in the year 1532 A.D.[3] He was the successor of Vira Narasingarāya *alias* Śellappa in the governorship of the Chōḻa country. Achyutarāya, the brother and successor of Krishnadēvarāya, was then the emperor of Vijayanagar. Śevappa was very closely related to the emperor Achyutarāya, as his wife Mūrtimāmba was the sister-in-law of the latter. The Telugu works and the *Tanjāvūri Añdhra Rājula Charitamu* and also the *Tānjāvūri Vāri Charitam* say that Śevappa got Tanjore from the emperor as *strīdhana* for his wife, while the *Sāhityaratnākara* mentions that Tanjore was acquired by Śevappa by his own valour. The latter view is upheld by Mr. T. S. Kuppusamy Sastri on the ground that the work is a contemporary one. Rāmabhadrāmba, the authoress of another contemporary work, the *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, and the *Vijayavilāsam* refer to the marriage of Śevappa with the sister of Achyutarāya's queen, but do not mention the subject of *stridhana*. So does the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* of Vijayarāghava Nayaka. All these statements are not mutually conflicting, but are helpful in arriving at the truth. Inscriptions[4] show that Śevappa belonged to a noble family of powerful generals, and he might have distinguished himself in the emperor's wars. Achyutarāya was very much impressed by his valour and permitted him to marry the sister of Tirumalāmba, one of his consorts.[5] When the question of appointing a new governor over Tanjore arose, he readily

1. 424 of 1928.
2. 259 of 1913.
3. 'Tanjore Añdhra Nāyaka Charitam' by K. Sitaramayya, M.A. The author assigns the date 1535 A.D. as marking the foundation of the Tanjore Nayakship, on the authority of an epigraph 271 of 1907 coming from Tiruvidaimarudur. The epigraph is said to be illegible but however, Mr. Sitaramayya says that it must refer to Śevappa. If this record should belong to him, then it will support the fact that he was established in Tanjore by the year 1532 A.D.
4. 145 of 1924 dated in the cyclic year Vikrama corresponding to A.D. 1522 registers a gift made on behalf of Tirumala Nayaka, the agent of Krisnadēvarāya by Dalaway (commander) Śevappa Nayaka. A. R. E. 1924, pp. 111 and 112.
5. *The Vijayavilāsam* says that Mūrtimāmba was the younger sister of Tirumalāmba. But Tirumalāmba in her 'Varadāmbikāparinayam', a kāvya full of romance, calls Varadāmbika as the queen of Achyutarāya and whose marriage is

thought of Śevappa, whom he deemed, by virtue of his close relationship and loyalty, as the fittest person for the post. Śevappa's rise was largely due to his own remarkable strength and to his marriage with Mūrtimāmba. Even the marriage of Śevappa with Mūrtimāmba is doubted by some scholars, who speak of the impossibility in those days of a Nayaka having marital relations with the royal house that claimed its descent from the kshatriyas. Mr. V. Prabhakara Sastri has laboured hard in his Introduction to the *Tanjāvūri Āndhra Rājula Charitam* on this question and comes to the conclusion that Tirumalāmba was not the queen consort of Achyutarāya, but only a courtesan, since the emperor a kshatriya could not marry a lady of a lower caste. A relatively lower caste status is ascribed to Tirumalāmba on the basis of her sister marrying Śevappa Nayaka who belonged to the fourth varṇa, *i.e.*, a Sūdra.[6] Unfortunately, these wrong assumptions regarding their caste status have no validity since the epigraphical[7] and literary evidences clearly show that Achyutarāya and his well-known ancestors, Īswara Nayaka and Narasa Nayaka, were all only Nayakas and not Kshatriyas.

Śevappa's parents were powerful nobles and they played a prominent part in the Vijayanagara wars with the Muhammadans. His epigraphs are few and far between and are also found outside the Chōḻa country proper. From a study of the provenance of his records he seems to have enjoyed jurisdiction over the whole of the present Tanjore district and part of the North Arcot district. His records are remark-

the theme of this work. The epigraphs also refer to Varadāmbika as his queen, and Kumāra Venkatādri was his son by this queen. Perhaps, Varadāmbika was the senior queen *Pattamahishi.* Tirumalāmba calls herself as the 'be all and end all of the deepest love of Achyutarāya.' (Introduction to '*Varadāmbikāparinayam,*'—Edited by Prof. Lakshman Sarup. Varadāmbika is called the daughter of one Salaka Kshitipa. ( Mahishipadē Salaka Kshitīsaturvarajātmajāh sit Varadāmbikā Vadūh). Tirumalāmba therefore appears to have been one of his queens. राजाधिराजाच्युतराय सार्वभौम प्रेम सर्वस्व विश्वास भुवा. The *Vijayavilāsam* and the *Subhadrā Pariṇayam* call her a queen of Achyuta and a talented poetess.

6. The literary works trace his origin from the feet of Vishnu. The *Raghunāthābhyudaya Nātakam* and the *Vijayavilāsam* by Ch. Venkatakavi and the epigraphs say that Śevappa belonged to the fourth caste.

'Vanajākshu padamula varalu vāhiniki
Anujayai mintsu Nālava jāti jagati
Ajātilōs thāla, Ādikulainaṭṭi
Rājulu Kondaru Prakyātiganiri.'

Also *Vijayavilāsam*, Introduction, p. 8. Also 497 of 1907.

7. 195 of 1913. The *Varāhapurāṇam* by Mallayya refers to Iswara Nayaka and others as the ancestors of Krishnadēvarāya. Also of 497 of 1907 from Neduṇgunram. The *Achyutarāyābhyudayam* and the *Varadāmbikāpariṇayam* speak of Achyutarāya's ancestors.

able for the absence of the customary valuable historical introductions found in the Chōḻa and the Pāṇḍya inscriptions and also the indication of the regnal years of their issue. The absence of these two important aspects in the Tanjore Nayaks' epigraphs in general and of Śevappa Nayaka in particular, present insurmountable difficulties in our attempt to correctly understand the sequence of the events of his rule. They do not give us any clue as to when Śevappa began to rule or as to when his power came to an end. Such literary evidence as will help us in our understanding of the epigraphs in their true historical perspective, is unfortunately wanting in these particulars also. The contemporary works like the *Sāhityaratnākaram* and the *Raghunāthābhyudayam* and the other work of the same name by Vijayarāghava Nayaka also do not help us with regard to the chronology. Hence a study of the history of the Tanjore Nayaks is beset with innumerable difficulties in spite of an abundance of traditional accounts and chronicles. The literary evidence presents differing versions regarding the ancestors of Śevappa's family. The *Raghunāthābhyudayam* and the *Rukmaṇipariṇayam*[8] by Rājachūdāmani Dikshita say that Śevappa was the son of Timmappa Nayaka or Timmabhūpati by his wife Bayyāmbika. Vijayarāghava Nayaka in his Telugu *Raghunāthābhyudayam* gives a genealogical list which begins with one Krishna whose son was Timma, the husband of Bayyāmbika; and he had four sons, *viz.*, Peḍḍa (elder) Śeva, Chiṇṇa (younger) Śeva, Peḍḍa Malla and Chiṇṇa Malla. Raṅgājamma, a courtesan and a poetess of Vijayarāghava's court, in her *Maṇṇārudāsavilāsam* and *Ushāpariṇayam* introduces another Timmappa, with his wife Gōpamāmba, between Krishna and Timmappa Nayaka, the husband of Bayyāmbika. She says that the Nayak's belonged to the Maṇṇāru gōtra (Maṇṇanāru gōtra vibhudēndrunin Vijarāghava Chaṇdruṇi).[9] Since all the works quoted above are contem-

8. *Raghunāthābhyudayam*, Canto VI, Sl. 1 to 10. Edited by Dr. T. R. Chintamani, Bulletins of the Sanskrit Department, Madras University.

It is said from the feet of Vishnu was born the Cauvery river. She had a sister who gave birth to many sons. One of them was Timmabhūpa whose wife was Bayyāmbika. Vide also *'Sources,'* p. 284. The translation reads 'In the śūdra caste born from the feet of Vishnu was born a king called Timma'.

9. *Rukmaṇipariṇayam*, since published by the Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.

Raṅgājamma speaks of Vijayarāghava as belonging to the Maṇṇāru gōtra. This will mean that the presiding deity *Maṇṇāru* (Vishnu) of the Maṇṇārgudi temple (Tanjore district) was their Kula dēvata (family god) and not to any *gōtra*, since the śūdras cannot claim any such thing. The śūdras are even now called as belonging to Siva and Vishnu *gōtras* according to their religious persuasion.

porary it is difficult to say which is correct and which is not, until further light should be thrown on this question. But all of them say that Śevappa Nayaka was the son of Timmappa Nayaka by his wife Bayyāmbika. The inscriptions of Śevappa confirm this statement[10]; and it may not be improbable that he had three brothers for the existence of whom we have, however, no direct evidence from the epigraphs.[11]

Timmappa Nayaka, *alias* Timmabhūpatī, must have been a powerful noble and also a ruler of some importance as the epithet bhūpati would indicate. Perhaps, he was the ruler of the North Arcot District with his capital at Nedungunram, a place thirty miles north of Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. The epigraphs of all the Tanjore Nayaks show that they, belonged to Nedungunram[12] and indicate that they must have had some connection with it. This finds further confirmation from their records found at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. One of Krishnadēvarāya's epigraphs mention a Timmappa who had the high privilege of serving him as his door-keeper (vāśal) and who took part in the Raichur campaign.[13] Perhaps he was the father of Śevappa Nayak,[14] who himself is described in an epigraph as the emperor's *daḷavāy* (commander).[15] Thus we see that Śevappa and his father were both serving the Vijayanagar emperors, Krishnadēvarāya and Achyutarāya, before the former was appointed to Tanjore. Śevappa himself had the high honour of serving Achyutarāya

10. 497 of 1907 dated Saka 1495 expired. Kuttalam, Tanjore district. Śevappa Nayaka was the son of Timmappa Nayaka of the fourth caste (Chaturtha gōtra) and who was a native of Nedungunrm in Toṇdaimaṇdalam. Also 424 of 1928 which says Chinna Chevva of the family of Timmabhūpa.

11. 376 of 1912 from Dēvikapuram and dated in the cyclic year Sārvari, refers to the arrangements made for the supply of ghee to the temple by Mallappa and Śevappa Nayaka for the merit of Achyutarāya. Sārvari would correspond to A.D. 1541-2. Also 383 of 1912 dated Saka 1464.

12. 497 of 1907 cited above and 75 of 1925 dated S. 1471. Śevappa Nayaka of Nedungunram.

13. 455 of 1906, Pirānmalai, Madura District, dated S. 144. 182 of 1932 dated S. 1436 from Kālahasti.

14. This Timmappa must be different from the other Timmappa Nayakas of the inscriptions of Krishnadēvarāya. 13 of 1927-28 refers to Timmappa Nayaningaru of Kundūrpisīme. Krishnadēvarāya's epigraphs refer to more than one Timmappa Nayaka. 404 of 1913 mentions a Timmappa Nayaka. The record is found at Salem. He is called the ruler of Nadunādu. 4 of 1930 mentions a Timmappa and is said to be the son of Eramānchi Chikka Timmappa Nayaka. 60 of 1934 from the North Arcot District dated 1526 A.D. refers to a Timmappa as the son of one Aṇṇāchi Nayaka.

15. 145 of 1924 dated S. 1433 from Nedungunram mentions one *dalavāy* Śevvappa Nayaka who is called an agent of Krishnadēvarāya cited before.

as his 'betel-bearer', equivalent to the office of Aḍappam in Tamil and Tāmbūla Karaṇḍavāhin in Sanskrit.[16]

Śevappa's rule was not marked by any notable event or wars; and his reign was one of peace and comparative prosperity and this is best seen in his works of charity and magnificent buildings. Śevappa remained a loyal feudatory of the emperor; and his epigraphs bear ample testimony to this fact. His inscriptions recording his gifts are dated in the reigns of his overlords, *viz.*, Achyutarāya, Sadāsivarāya and Tirumala. An epigraph of Śevappa from the Tanjore district is recorded in the reign of Sadāsivarāya.[17] The Vijayanagar kings had full control over their feudatory Nayaks, right from the beginning; and the presence of a number of epigraphs of Krishnadēvarāya and Achyutadēvarāya in the Chōḷa country confirms their supremacy.[18] The great minister Gōvinda Dikshita, in his introduction to the *Sangīta Sudhā*, speaks of Śevappa's loyalty and interest in the affairs of the empire when he gives him the *biruda—Karṅāta śimhāṣana kārya ḍuryaha.*[19] On account of his relationship with the emperor under whose patronage the Tanjore Nayakship was founded, Śevappa must have been held in high esteem and regard by the neighbouring Nayak rulers of Madura and Gingee; and there apparently existed happy and friendly relations between them.

One of the earliest features of Śevappa's reign was the transfer of Trichinopoly which was then comprehended in the Tanjore governorship, to the Madura Nayak, in exchange for Vallam.[20] Viswanātha Nayak is said to have fortified Trichinopoly by building a double-walled fort therein and by constructing a big tank inside it. The necessity for fortifying the place, it is said in the chronicles, was due to the predatory ravages and hardships from which the country suffered at the hands of robbers who swooped down on the pilgrims bound for Rāmēswaram and caused much injury to them, both bodily and materially. Taylor says that

16. 380 of 1919 from Little Conjeevaram. Achyutappa Nayaka is called the son of Aḍappam Chinna Śevappa Nayaka.

17. 72 of 1925 (Māṇdai, Tanjore District). The cyclic year Sādhārana will correspond to 1549 A.D. and another from Tiruvaṇṇamalai 427 of 1928 dated 1569 A.D. refers to the same overlord.

18. 39 of 40 of 1897 of Achyutarāya are found in the Tōppūr Pillayar temple at Tanjore and are dated S. 1454 and S. 1401 respectively. 271 of 1907 from Tiruvadamarudur is dated S. 1456. 261 of 1917 from Tirumakkōttai. 116 of 1931-32 is dated S. 1459, Paṇdanallūr, Tanjore District.

19. 'Sangīta Sudhā' Introduction, sloka 28. Published in the Journal of the Madras Music Academy.

20. Taylor, 'Oriental Historical' Mss.,' Vol. II, p. 109.

Viswanātha Nayaka effected this transfer by giving over Vallam to the king of Tanjore. He was the ruler of Tanjore also besides Madura before the establishment of Śevappa Nayaka as the governor of the Tanjore country. Hence the ruler of Tanjore mentioned in the chronicles was no other than Śevappa himself, whose rule began in 1532 A.D. Both Viswanatha and Śevappa were feudatories of Achyutarāya. Śevappa who was just then appointed to Tanjore could not have effected this arrangement of his own accord. Evidently, the transfer was arranged by Achyutarāya himself while he was staying at Srirangam and also before he appointed Śevappa to Tanjore. This looks probable since the emperor reconstituted his southern territories and put them on an enduring basis needed for making full arrangements.[21]

Śevappa continued the same loyal and friendly attitude towards Sadāsivarāya, the Vijayanagara emperor and his general Rāmarāja Viṭhaladēva Mahārāya, when the latter came to the South on an expedition against the Tiruvaḍi Raja about the year 1545 A.D. and remained for about a decade at Trichinopoly as the viceroy of the south. Śevappa in all probability might have offered his help to Rāmarāja Viṭhala in his wars against the Tiruvaḍi king as well as against the Paravas of the Fishery Coast.[22]

21. *'Nayaks of Madura"* p. 52. Prof. Sathianatha Aiyar says that 'this must have been an imperial arrangement, for the empire was yet too strong to allow so much independence to the provinces.' The transfer of Vallam has been given different dates. *The Tanjore District Gazetteer,* p. 38 gives 1623 A.D. *The Tanjore Manual,* p. 751, has 1560 A.D. Mr. K. Sitharamayya Garu, 'Tanjore Andhra Nayaka Charitamu, p. 95 says, that the whole transaction must have been made during the time of a Chōḷa king and strangely enough, he speaks at the same time also of the possibility of Achyutarāya making this arrangement. Father Heras, *Aravidu Dynasty,* p. 129, says that this happened after 1539 A.D. 1532 A.D. satisfies all the circumstances and is also supported by evidence. We need not go into an examination and criticism of the various discrepant dates mentioned above. That Vallam and Trichinopoly were exchanged between Tanjore and Madura by Achyutarāya looks fairly satisfactory.

22. Rāmarāja Viṭhala's imposing expedition into the south was due to two causes which were of vital importance to the empire. The efforts of Udaya Mārṭhānda Varma, the king of Travancore to extend his dominion in the east and the appointment of a viceroy by him over the newly acquired territories in the present Tinnevelly District asked for the imperial intervention. "Udaya Mārtānda Varma, whose surname according to epigraphs was Maṇkonda Bhūtala Vīra Sri Vīra Udaya Mārtānda Varma, was a famous warrior who conquerred almost the whole of the Tinnevelly District. He married a princess, known as Chōḷakulavalli, who brought with her the district of Kalakād as dowry. The king made Kalakād his capital and built in it a new palace, called Vīra Mārtānda Chaturvēdimangalam Pudumāḷigai. He was the first of the three Bhutala Viras whose names occur in

Viṭhaladēva's viceroyalty did not contribute anything mateially to the rule of the Tanjore Nayaks and his authority was above those of the Nayaks in general.[23] It was during this period that the famous battle of Talikota was fought between the armies of Rāmarāja on the one side and the Muhammadans on the other.[24] We read from Ferishta that Rāmarāja on the eve of this war issued an order summoning all his dependents and rāyas from the banks of the Krishna as far as the island of Ceylon.[25] Muthukrishnappa Nayaka of Madura (1564-72) is said to have despatched an army under the captainship of Ariyanātha Mudaliar.[26] But there is nothing to refer to the part played by Tanjore

the coins of Tinnevelly. He gave grants of land as paḷḷichchandam to the god of the temple of Nagercoil at the special request of Guṇavīra Panditan and Kamalavāhana Panditan, probably Jainas. He protected the Christian Paravas of Kumarimuttam near Cape Comorin from being harassed by taxation at the hands of their Hindu brethren (Pillar Inscription of 20th Mīnam 701 M.E.=1526 A.D.). The Christians were evidently those converted by Father Miguel Vaz. The Travancore ruler was described by St. Francis Xavier in one of his letters of 1544, as "the great king having authority all over South India." [Ed.]

The more important cause seems to be the growth of a powerful influence as a result of missionary enterprise in the Fishery Coast. 'The coast region was open to Portuguese enterprise and the chief ports of the south contained Portuguese factories'. 'The advent of Francis Xavier in the southern region created a new and powerful influence the political aspects of which have not received adequate attention among the historians of this period. The Paravas, the fisherfolk along the coast were being rapidly converted to Christianity, and such conversion was interpreted as involving a change of allegiance of the inhabitants from their Indian rulers to the king of Portugal. This wholesale conversion of a class of industrious inhabitants of the coast, including among them those engaged in the valuable pearl-fishing, made them ipso facto subjects of the king of Portugal.' The Empire could not look on with indifference this transference of territory from his allegiance to that of the king of Portugal by the peaceful efforts of Portuguese missionaries. Rāmarāja Viṭhala's invasion resulted in the reduction of the Parava Coast 'to its normal sense of political allegiance.' See '*Nayaks of Madura,*' Introduction, pp. 13-14. Also p. 90 foot-note. Father Heras gives a detailed account of this invasion in his '*Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara,*' pp. 159-162.

23. 140 of 1895 from Tiruvadamarudur belongs to Sadāsiva Rāya and it records a gift of two villages by Rāmarāja Viṭhaladēva. The record was issued by Rāmarāja in the Tanjore country while Śevappa was the ruler. 104 of 1911 from the Tanjore country dated S. 1482 (1560 A.D.) refers to a settlement made by Krishnamarājayyan the son of Aliya Rāmarāja. He appointed a certain Gñānaprakāsar Paṇdāram of Tiruvārur as the supervisor of the temples at Sikkil, Vadagudi and Vōdachēri. The epigraphist says that 'Krishnamarājayyan was evidently a ruler of some portion of Tanjore.' A.R.E., 1911.

24. For an account of the battle, see Heras, Chapter IX.

25. Briggs, Ferishta, Vol. III, pp. 413-4.

26. 431 of 1928 from Tiruvaṇṇāmalai, records Śevappa Nayak's loyalty to Tirumalarāya I in 1570 A.D., a few years after the battle of Talikota 1565 A.D.

in this war. The chronicles do not mention Śevappa's help rendered to the empire, but all of them speak of his loyalty and faithfulness. As a loyal subordinate, Śevappa Nayaka must have helped the emperor in this hour of need, along with the ruler of Madura and others.

Nothing more is known of Śevappa's reign except his works of charity and public utility. He constructed temples, repaired numerous tanks and founded agrahāras. He repaired the Sivagaṇgā tank at Tanjore and to ensure full supply of water he caused to be dug a feeder tank which was called after him. Even to-day the tank goes by the name of Śeppanēri a contracted form for Śevappanēri. The Sivagaṇgā fort also was repaired by him.[27] He also built the magnificent tower (gōpura) composed of eleven storeys of the Arunāchalēswara temple at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. 419 of 1928 from Tiruvaṇṇāmalai says that in the year 1572 A.D. the gōpura was built at the request of one Sivanēsa and his brother Lōkanātha.[28] This great achievement of Śevappa Nayak was much appreciated and extolled by the people who recorded their praise in beautiful verses which are still to be found.[29] The *Raghunāthābhyudayam* and the *Sangīta Sudhā,* besides mentioning his building the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai gopura, refer to his other works.[30] Śevappa is said to have constructed the massive prākāras in the temples at Vriḍḍhāchalam and Conjeevaram and covered the vimānas of both the Tirupati and Srīsailam temples with gold. In the Chōḻa country his benefactions impartially extended to both the Siva and Vishnu temples situated on either side of the holy river Cauvery. Besides, he made gifts of villages[31] and precious jewels to the gods and provided for the feeding of the Brahmans. The *Vijayavilāsam* and the *Rājagōpalavilāsam* refer to these gifts and speak of his pious deeds. *The Tanjāvūri Añdhra Rājula Charitamu* also mentions his building of the gōpura and the prākāras of the Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and Vriḍḍhāchalam temples, respectively. The gifts made to these temples and the large contributions made to Siva and Vishnu temples show Śevap-

27. Of the two forts at Tanjore the small fort is said to have been built by Śevappa and the bigger by Vijayarāghava. *Annual Report of Archaeological Department, S. Circle,* 1912-13.

28. 419 of 1928. Śevappa is called Timmappa Chiṇṇaśevvanṛpati

29. The verses are said to have been composed by one Srinivasa Dikshita of Satyamangalam, A.R.E., 1928, Pt. II. An account of this composer is also given.

30. Raghunāthābhyudayam, Canto VI, Sl. 7-10. Sangīta Sudhā, Introd., Sl. 28-33.

31. 421 of 1928 registers a gift of villages to the temple at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai. 27 of 1925 dated S. 1497 comes from Mūvaḻūr in the Tanjore district. It records a *sarvamāṇya* gift of land ten *vēlis,* for the maintenance of a choultry attached to the temple.

pa's patronage of these two leading religions. A spirit of toleration was largely developed by the Tanjore Nayaks who were Vaishṇavas by religious persuasion. His benefactions were extended to the other religious faiths such as Buddhism and Muhammadanism. An epigraph coming from the Kumbakōnam Taluk (292 of 1927) and dated 1579 A.D. refers to a Buddhist temple to which lands were allotted by the people in exchange of lands that belonged to the temple and which were used by them for other purposes.[32] An inscription (425 of 1924) found on the wall of the Samuśarupalli mosque in Tanjore registers a grant of seven *vēlis* of land made to the faqirs of the mosque by five Maṇṇaiyārs of Naṇjikkōttai at the instance of Śevappa in the year 1550 A.D. The patronage given by him to the Mādhvā religion is also seen in his grants made. In 1574 A.D. the great Mādhvā teacher, Vijayīndra Tirtha Sripāda, received a grant of a village from the Nayaka.[33] Śevappa also

32. The record states that the people of Tirumalairājapuram having had to cut a channel through the land that belonged to the Buddhist temple at Tiruviḷandurai, they made compensation by assigning 2¾ *velis* of land in Tirumalairājapuram. 'The Leyden grant refers to a Buddhist temple at Negapatam as early as the 18th century. The Buddha images within a radius of five miles of Kumbakōnam, one at the entrance into the Tiruvaḷaṇjuli temple and another within the temple at Pattīswaram and a third miscalled Bhārgavarishi in a Ganēsa shrine in Kumbakōnam itself testify to the prevalence of the Buddhist religion though perhaps in a fugitive condition in the heart of the Tanjore district in mediaeval times. The present record is of interest in that it mentions a Buddha temple in the Kumbakōnam taluk till so late as the time of Śevappa Nayaka. A. R. E. 1927, part II, p. 116.

33. The Arivīḻimaṇgalam plates. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XII, p. 357. Śevappa Nayaka was also responsible for another grant made to the same maṭha by Srirangaraya. (Mysore Archaeological Report, 1917, p. 17). Here the king is called Vīrachevva Bhūpa and he is described as 'a moon to the ocean of Timmappa.' The record which is dated in A.D. 1575 registers the gift of Nāvalūr and Pūkkudi villages to the great teacher Surēndra Tīrtha, the spiritual guru of Vijayīndra Tīrtha. Besides, these two grants, the Rāghavēndraswāmi maṭha at Naṇjangūd is in possession of three copper plate grants referring to the Tanjore Nayak's benefactions. One of them, dated 1580 A.D. belongs to Śevappa and records a grant of villages in the Mayavaram Taluk, made to Vijayīndra Tīrtha at Kumbakōnam. The record bears the emblem of a boar which was the *lāṇchana* of the Vijayanagar kings and is signed Sri Rājagōpāla. The plates give an account of Śevappa's ancestors beginning from Vishnu, Ganga, Earth and Dēvaraja. The last mentioned person is said to have been a minister of Krishnadēvarāya and to have captured the fort of Udayagiri. His son was Chiṇṇarāja by his wife Maṇgalāmbika; and Chiṇṇarāja was Rāmarāja's minister. He had two sons Śevappa and Chiṇṇa Śevappa. The plates say that Chiṇṇarāja was the founder of the Tanjore Nayaks. He was succeeded by Śevappa whom his brother Chiṇṇaśevappa regarded as his father. The record says that Vijayīndra and Tātāchārya, the great Vaishnava scholar and Appayya

made provision for the celebration of festivals. One Kālāttināthа Mudaliar who appears as the signatory of a record (245 of 1927) of Śevappa which relates to a gift of lands, must have been an officer of the king.

Śevappa Nayaka's patronage extended even to Europeans like the Portuguese who had then captured the maritime trade of South India from the Arabs. The Portuguese came to India and landed on the west coast towards the close of the 15th century. Soon their power increased and this was made possible by the complete absence of European rivalry and the impotence of the Mussalmans to resist their guns and ships. They carried on a large volume of trade with Ceylon, having established themselves both on the west coast as well as in the neighbourhood of the Fishery Coast. Their missionaries converted the Paravas of the Fishery Coast of Tinnevelly and soon grew powerful. It was their objectionable activities and mass conversions that stimulated the expedition of Rāmarāja Viṭhaladēva. The Portuguese soon came to possess factories on the Coromandel Coast the earliest being those of San Thome de Meliapur and Negapatam. Ferishta, speaking of the Christians in the year 963 A.H. (1556 A.D.), says 'that the Christians held the ports of Mangalore and Negapatam in the extreme south of the Peninsula.[34] By 1586 A.D. Negapatam had become a flourishing centre and came to possess a governor of its own.' Diogo Fernandez Penoa from Negapatam is said to have helped the Portuguese against the attacks of the Ceylonese king Rājasimha.[35] The Portuguese, either in the beginning of Śevappa's reign or even a little earlier, had settled at Negapatam and carried on trade between the outside world and the kingdom of Tanjore. An anonymous life of St. Xavier says that the Portuguese 'were greatly favoured by the lord of that country who is a very powerful captain of the king of Bisnaga.' Soon the Portuguese

Dikshita, the Advaita scholar used to meet in the court of Śevappa. The other two records dated 1614 A.D. in the reign of Chinnaśeva refer to further grants made to the same Vijayīndra Tīrtha. Śevappa, the brother of Chinnaśeva, is said to have been residing at Kumbakonam leaving the kingdom in the hands of the latter. The records in question were prepared at the instance of the king by his minister whose name is not mentioned. It is said that Chinnaśeva may be identified with Achyutappa ('Sāhityaratnākara' Canto III, Sl. 28). This view is not correct since the verse referred to speaks of him as Chinnaśeva Achyuta and not Chinnaśeva as is surmised. However, the genealogy contained in these plates differ in all essential respects from that of the literary and epigraphical evidence. One would like to know more about these plates and their paleography in particular before giving them their due importance and proper consideration. Already a note of warning is sounded in the same report regarding the authenticity of the grants of Sriranga given to the maṭha.

34. Briggs, Ferishta, Vol. IV, p. 534.

35. F. C. Danvers, *The Portuguese in India*, Vol. II, p. 32 and 76.

acquired royal favour in the Nayak's court. The Portuguese fortified the place and erected a fort and two churches, one dedicated to St. Francis of Assisi and the other to Our Lady of Health. It is recorded that in the very first year of the Portuguese occupation of Negapatam about 300 Hindus were baptized. Cesare Federici wrote of Negapatam in 1567 A.D. 'as a very great city and very populous of Christians of the country and partly gentile.[36] St. Xavier visited the town about 1550 A.D. Śevappa appears to have given them protection and permitted them to trade in his land. The erection of buildings could not have been possible but for the royal favour.[37]

Śevappa Nayaka, had a long reign and lived to a ripe age, having spent the major part of his life in his newly acquired kingdom. An inscription of his from Kumbakonam (Tanjore District) mentions A.D. 1579-80 and it is the latest date so far known.[38] The *Sāhityaratnākara*[39] says that he appointed his son Achyutappa Nayaka as Yuvarāja and put him in charge of the administration. Achyutappa's earliest epigraph is dated in the year 1560 A.D.[40] Śevappa ruled for about twenty-one years from A.D. 1532 to A.D. 1563 as king and spent the rest of his life in performing acts of piety,[41] till his death in 1580 A.D.[42] In his last days he appointed one Gōvinda Dikshita as his minister who later on became famous as a good administrator and a wise counsellor. Gōvinda Dikshita's name is still remembered by the people of the Tanjore country. 422 of 1928 from Tiruvaṇṇāmalai dated Saka 1502 (1580 A.D.) contains two verses by one Gōvindasūri who styling himself as a dependent of Śevappa Bhūpa expresses gratitude for favours received, by composing verses in praise of him. In all probability the author is identical with Gōvinda Dikshita who became the minister of Śevappa's successors.[43] Mr. Sitaramayya speaks of two images of Śevappa, one in the big Temple at Tanjore and the other in the Venkataramaṇaswāmi temple. However, they are not labelled Śevappa and Mr. Sitaramayya himself says that nothing definite could be said about them.

36. Heras '*The Aravidu Dynasty*', pp. 174-175.

37. 'Tanjore Gazetteer' p. 244 says that Śevappa was opposed to the Portuguese.

38. 292 of 1927 contains the cyclic year Vikrama, Ādi. It corresponds to 1579-80 A.D.

39. Canto III, Sloka 17.

40. 536 of 1904. The cyclic year Rudrōdgāri and the Saka year 1480 do not agree. The cyclic year must be Raudri.

41. His epigraphs from Tiruvaṇṇāmalai and other places recording his works of building gōpuras, etc., are dated only after 1563 A.D.

42. Mr. K. Sitaramayya supposes that Śevappa must have lived till 1580 A.D. T. S. Kuppuswami Sastri assigns 1572 A.D. as his last known date.

43. A.R.E. 1928, Part II, p. 86.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

*Brown University, Rhode Island :*

*Selected topics in function theory of a complex variable by Otto Syasz.*

*Theory of abstract spaces by David Tamarkin*

*The Service*

*Lingnan Science Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1.*

*The Modern Student*

*The Empire Times*

*Madras Y.M.C.A. Bulletin*

*Subodin*

*Indian Swarajya*

*The Journal of the Greater India Society*

*A Journal of Indian Renaissance*

*Rektorwechsel an der Universitet Leipzig*

*Travaux de l'Institut Mathematique de Tbilissi I*

*Academie des Sciences de l'U. R. S. S.—Filial Georgienne*

*On the Devonian Coelacanthids of Germany with special reference to the Dermal Skeletar (Stockholm).*

*Ethnology, Folklore and Archaelogy in the U.S.S.R.*

*E. A. Weiss : Einfuhrung in die Liniengeometrie und Kinematik*

*Proceedings of the University of Durham Philosophical Society*

*Osaka Imperial University : Collected papers from the Faculty of Science*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Series A* | *Mathematics* | *Vol. V.* |
| *B* | *Physics* | „ „ „ |
| *C* | *Chemistry* | „ „ „ |

*Man in India, Volume XVIII, Decr. '39*

*Spolia Zeylanica.*

*Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society.*

*Scripta Mathematica.*

*Gram Udyog Patrika.*

*Hamburgische Universitat-Reden.*

*Report of the South Indian National Association and Ranade Library*

*Kungl Svenska Vetenskaspsakademiens Handlingar Tredje Serien Band 14 Nos. 1 to 3.*

1. *Das Wachstum der Korperlange des Menschen.*
2. *Studies in the Gems Astelia Banks Et Solander.*
3. *Examen Rosarum Sneciae Granskringavden Svenska Florans Rosa-Former.*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (*Contd.*)

*Etudes sur un probleme de Majoration.*
*The Journal of the Madras Geographical Association.*
*Wealth and Welfare.*
*Hermathena: Literature, Science and Philosophy.*
*The Indian Historical Quarterly.*
*Annales de Universite de Paris, July-Oct. '39*
*New Indian Antiquary.*
*The Modern Education Society, Poona, Annual Report.*
*Madras Youngmen.*
*The Jaina Antiquary, Vol. IV, No. 11.*
*The Alcyonarian Genus Bathyalcyon (Stockholm) Band 16, No. 5.*
*Litorale Amphipoden des Trophischen Pazifiks Band 16, No. 6.*
*Aminoff (G) etc., Uber Die Oxydation Von Zinkblende-Einkrinstallen, An Hand Von Elektroneninterferenzen Studiert.*
*Nagaripracharani Patrika.*
*Indian Academy of Sciences—Abstracts of papers.*
*The Commercial Review.*
*The Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*
*Indian photography and cinematography*
*The Rural India*

## EXCHANGE LIST

*Hindustan Review.*
*Half Yearly Journal of the Mysore University.*
*Economica, London.*
*Philosophical Quarterly.*
*Journal of the Indian Chemical Society.*
*Reading University Gazette.*
*Mysore Economic Journal.*
*Chemical Abstracts, Easton Pa.*
*The Punjab University Gazette.*
*Journal of the Bombay University.*
*Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society.*
*Publications by the Oriental Library, Baroda.*
*Publications by Kungl. Universitetes Bibliotek, Uppsala, Sweden.*
*Publications by Tohoku Imperial University, Sendai, Japan.*
*Journal of the Madras University.*
*Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient— Hanoi (Indo-China).*
*Djwa—Java-Institute, Jogjakarta, Java.*
*Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, Bengal—Annual Report and Monographs*
*Quarterly Journal of the Kannada Literary Academy.*
*Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society.*
*Indian Culture.*
*Scripta Mathematica.*
*Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.*
*Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
*Review of Philosophy and Religion.*
*Publications of the U.S.S.R. Society for Cultural relations with foreign countries, Russia.*
*Proceedings of the Durham Philosophical Society, Newcastle.*
*Collected papers from the Faculty of Science, Osaka.*
*Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society.*
*Science and Culture, Calcutta.*
*Indian Co-operative Review, Madras.*
*Epigraphica Indica.*
*Spolia Zeylanica.*
*Publications of the R. Swedish Academy of Sciences, Stockholm.*
*Bijdragen Tot De Taal, Land-En Volkenkunde Van Nederland-Indie-s-Gravenhage.*

## EXCHANGE LIST (*Contd.*)

*Monthly Weather Report*, Poona.
*Scientific Reports of the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research.*
*The Aryan Path.*
*Indiana.*
*Vishwa Vani—A journal of Indian Renaissance.*
*Journal of the Madras Geographical Association.*
*Man in India*
*The Poona Orientalist*
*Publications by the Industrial Intelligence and Research Bureau, Simla*
*The Mathematics Teacher, New York.*
*Duke Mathematical Journal*
*Publications of the Brown University, U.S.A.*
*Transactions of Tbilissian Mathematical Institute, Russia*
*Lingnan Science Journal*
*London University Gazette*
*The Adyar Library Bulletin.*
*The Indian Historical Quarterly.*
*The Vedanta Kesari.*
*Tamil Pozhil.*
*Annales de l'University de Paris.*
*The Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*
*Indian photography and cinematography*

# UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

| Names of Publications. | Author. | Price. |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Factory Labour in India | Prof. A. Mukhtar .. | 3 0 0 |
| 2. Bhoja Raja | Prof. P. T. Srinavasa Ayyangar .. | 1 8 0 |
| 3. Swaramelakalanidhi | Mr. M. S. Ramaswami Ayyar | 2 0 0 |
| 4. Naveena Tarkam | Mr. K. R. Applachariar .. | 2 0 0 |
| 5. Text and commentary of *Tattvavibhavana* by Parameswara, a commentary on Vacaspati Misra's Tattvabindu. | Mr. V. A. Ramaswami Sastriar | 3 0 0 |
| 6. Sri Mukundamala | Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti .. | 3 0 0 |
| 7. Svarasiddhanta Candrika | Srinivasayajvan. Edited by Mr. K. A. Sivaramakrishna Sastri .. | 5 0 0 |
| 8. Acoustics | Mr. R. K. Viswanathan .. | 1 8 0 |
| 9. Pari Pattu | Vidvan R. Raghava Ayyangar | 2 0 0 |
| 10. Trimsacchloki | | |
| 11. The Distributive Co-operation in India | Mr. V. G. Ramakrishna Ayyar | 1 0 0 |
| 12. Nyāyakuliśa | Edited by Prof. R. Ramanujachari and Pandit K. Srinivasacharya. | |
| 13. A Text-book in Tamil on Chemistry, Vol. I. | Mr. N. Ananthavaidyanathan. | 3 0 0 |
| 14. The Madras Agriculturists' Relief Act—A study. | Dr. B. V. Narayanasvami Nayudu and P. Vaidyanathan, M.A. | |
| 15. Report on the Working of Prohibition in Salem. | C. Jagannathachari, M.A., M. Litt. | |

For copies apply to :—The Registrar, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 16. The University Journal Published by the University | The Editor, The University Journal, Annamalainagar | |

Annual Subscription Rs. 7-0-0 (Internal) 10s. (Foreign)

| | |
|---|---|
| A Text-book in Tamil on Chemistry (Vol. II.) | *(In the Press.)* |
| A Text-book in Tamil on Physics | Do. |
| The History of Gingee | Do. |
| The History of Tamil Literature | Do. |
| Siddhitraya | Do. |
| Nītimāla | Do. |
| Vedārthasaṁgraha | Do. |

**PUBLICATIONS**

**OF**

# The Inter-University Board, India.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Handbook of Indian Universities .. | 2 | 0 | 0 | *or* 3*s*. 6*d*. |
| 2. | Facilities for Oriental Studies and Research at Indian Universities .. | 0 | 8 | 0 | |
| 3. | Facilities for Scientific Research at Indian Universities .. | 0 | 12 | 0 | |
| 4. | Bulletin of the Inter-University Board, India, No. 1 to 13 .. | 1 | 0 | 0 | *each* |
| 5. | Biological Outlook on life and its Problems.—By J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., LL.D., Regius Professor of Natural History, University of Aberdeen .. | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| 6. | Second, Third and Fourth Conference of Indian Universities .. | 1 | 0 | 0 | *each* |
| 7. | Training of Teachers in Indian Universities .. | 0 | 8 | 0 | |
| 8. | Bibliography of Doctorate Theses in Science and Arts accepted by Indian Universities from January, 1930 .. | 0 | 8 | 0 | |
| 9. | Annual Report of the Inter-University Board for 1938-39 .. | 1 | 0 | 0 | |

POSTAGE AND V. P. CHARGES EXTRA.

*Available from*

THE BANGALORE PRESS,
"LAKE VIEW"
*Mysore Road, Bangalore City.*

# MYSORE ECONOMIC JOURNAL.

The only Journal of its kind published regularly on the 7th of each month for over twenty years. Has a number of contributors and reviewers attached to it. Bright and topical in its contents, it has ever stood out for progressive and suggestive comments on public affairs and well being. Sir Roper Lethbridge called it the "Most admirable Journal". Annual subscription Rs. 6.

From the Book Department, books on economic matters can be always ordered. The following books are available for sale from stock:

PLANNED ECONOMY FOR INDIA by Sir M. Visvesvaraya, K.C.I., LL.D. Price Rs. 6.

MADURA SOURASHTRA COMMUNITY by K. R. R. Sastry, M.A., M.L., F.R. ECON. S. Price Re. 1.

INDIAN CASTE SYSTEM by C. Hayavadana Rao, B.A., B.L., F. R. ECON. S. Price Re. 1.

STUDIES IN RURAL ECONOMICS by S. Kesava Iyengar, M.A. Price Rs. 8.

TOWARDS NATIONAL SELF SUFFICIENCY by Dr. P. J. Thomas, M.A., B.LITT., PH.D. Price As. 4.

MYSORE GAZETTEER (3 VOLS.). Edited by C. Hayavadana Rao, B.A., B.L. Price per set Rs. 20. Can also be had in parts at prices varying from Rs. 2 to Rs. 8 per volume.

*Postage extra in all cases*

*Apply to:—*

MANAGER, "Mysore Economic Journal",
No. 19, Gundopunt Buildings, Siddicutta,
BANGALORE CITY.

# THE ADYAR LIBRARY

*Director*: Dr. G. Srinivasa Murti, B.A., B.L., M.B. & C.M., Vaidyaratna.

*Jt. Director and Curator for Western Section*: Bhikshu Arya Asanga.

*Curator for Eastern Section*: Prof. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.PHIL. (Oxon.).

---

# BRAHMAVIDYA

## THE ADYAR LIBRARY BULLETIN

APPEARING FOUR TIMES A YEAR.

*Editor*: PROF. C. KUNHAN RAJA, M.A., D.PHIL. (OXON.)

*Rates of Subscription*:

Life Subscription Rs. 100
or $ 50
or £ 10

| | | Per Annum | Single Copy |
|---|---|---|---|
| India & Ceylon | .. | Rs. 6 | Rs. 2–8 |
| U. S. A. | .. | $ 3 | $ 1·25 |
| British Empire | .. | Sh. 12 | Sh. 5. |
| Other Countries | .. | Rs. 9 | Rs. 3–8 |

*All Communications to be addressed to*:

THE DIRECTOR,
*Adyar Library*,
Adyar, Madras, S., India.

## THE VEDANTA KESARI

A high class monthly devoted to the solution of spiritual problems, and to the study of religion, philosophy and culture of all countries, from the liberal and catholic point of view embodied in the life and teachings of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda.

It has been in existence from 1914, and publishes articles, both popular and learned, from the pen of leading thinkers and writers of the East and the West. Has circulation in India, Ceylon, F.M.S., U.S.A. and Europe.

SUBSCRIPTION : *Inland Rs. 3 ; Foreign $* **2** *or Sh. 8, per annum. Its subscribers get several of our publications at concession rate.*

*Apply to :—*

**The Manager**

**VEDANTA KESARI**

**Mylapore, Madras.**


DL 74 m 2 IIA, N32

94975

## RATES OF ADVERTISEMENT

| PARTICULARS. | PER ISSUE. | | | PER TWO ISSUES. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rs. | A. | P. | Rs. | A. | P. |
| Back Cover | 15 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| Inside Back Cover | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Inside Page | 8 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Inside Half Page | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |


Printed and published by G. Srinivasachari, B.A., at G. S. Press, 21, Narasingapuram Street, Mount Road, Madras.